

# SELECT ENGLISH SPEECHES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

EDITED  
WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY  
C. J. SISSON, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE, ELPHINSTONE COLLEGE, BOMBAY



HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, MELBOURNE  
BOMBAY AND MADRAS

1917





## PREFACE

THE main value of this collection of Speeches is the training in the methods and procedure of English parliamentary debate that an intelligent study will give. Most of the subjects, moreover, have both a permanent interest and a topical interest. The editor has sought to correlate the problems that arise in the study of these subjects with similar problems of to-day and of India, and to provide in the Introduction enough historical material to prepare the student for such study.

The example, finally, of the lofty tone, the ripe knowledge, the studied courtesy, and the literary quality of the speeches of these parliamentary giants of old should not fail to influence the student in his Debating Society and later on in wider spheres also, and to spread the high traditions of the Mother of Parliaments.





# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	3
INTRODUCTION :	
<i>Part I.</i> The Subjects and Occasions of the Speeches :	
SPEECH I. Copyright . . . . .	7
SPEECHES II AND V. Parliamentary Representation .	10
SPEECH III. Armaments . . . . .	17
SPEECH IV. Slavery and Secession . . . . .	21
SPEECH VI. Education . . . . .	26
<i>Part II.</i> Oratory and the Orators . . . . .	31
<i>Part III.</i> Parliamentary Etiquette and Procedure .	43
TEXT OF THE SPEECHES :	
I. THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY, <i>afterwards</i> LORD MACAULAY :	
Literary Copyright ( <i>House of Commons</i> , February 5, 1841) . . . . .	47
II. BENJAMIN DISRAELI, <i>afterwards</i> EARL OF BEACONS- FIELD :	
National Representation ( <i>House of Commons</i> , June 20, 1848) . . . . .	62

	PAGE
III. RICHARD COBDEN :	
International Reduction of Armaments ( <i>House of Commons</i> , June 17, 1851) . . . . .	85
IV. JOHN BRIGHT :	
Slavery and Secession in America ( <i>Rochdale</i> , February 3, 1863) . . . . .	96
V. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE :	
The Extension of the Suffrage ( <i>House of Commons</i> , April 27, 1866) . . . . .	111
VI. JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE :	
Education ( <i>University of St. Andrews</i> , March 19, 1869) . . . . .	154
NOTES . . . . .	181

## INTRODUCTION

## PART I

## THE SUBJECTS AND OCCASIONS OF THE SPEECHES

SPEECH I: COPYRIGHT

COPYRIGHT may conveniently be defined as meaning the exclusive right to copy, print, distribute, and sell a work of art, whether it be a book, a statue, a painting, a musical composition, or a drama. Common law, the custom of the country, has always admitted that this right vests in the author and that he may dispose of it by sale. In the seventeenth century we find a large traffic in copyrights, which were looked upon as the absolute and permanent property of the authors, and were therefore sold by them in perpetuity. The only legal protection for such traffic was that afforded by the Statute of Monopolies of 1623, which abolished all monopolies except the rights of inventors, a word that might be held to include authors, and by the Licensing Act of 1662, which prohibited the printing of books without the consent of the owner. It may be pointed out that copyright is strictly a monopoly, as Macaulay argued in his speech, when it is protected by legislation. But from 1623 onwards Parliament has distinguished between such monopolies as copyright and patent rights, which ensure that a man shall profit by his own



labour, and unjust monopolies, which arrogate to one man, and refuse to all others, the right to trade in a certain commodity.

The Licensing Act of 1662 lapsed in 1679, and Parliament, perceiving that 'books were printed without the consent of their authors, to their very great detriment and too often to the ruin of them and their families,' dealt explicitly with the question in the Copyright Act of 1709. This act ensured the copyright of a book for fourteen years from the date of publication, and for a further term of fourteen years if the author were still living. The law was enforced by fines and forfeits, and was regulated by the registration of books at Stationers' Hall. The act overruled perpetual copyrights, hitherto believed legal, though this was not settled in the law courts until 1774.

In 1801 this Act was confirmed, the fines were increased, and foreign reprints of English books were made contraband. In 1814 a further Copyright Act fixed the period of copyright at twenty-eight years, or until the end of the author's life. We now approach the occasion of Macaulay's speech on the subject.

There was undoubted hardship in the action of the law as it then stood. Sir Walter Scott had been unable to leave much to his children except property in the shape of copyrights. The early lapse of these copyrights would leave them without provision. Such a poet as Wordsworth, again, whose works were not appreciated and did not sell until late in his life, would derive no profit from his copyrights. Therefore Carlyle presented a petition to the House of Commons in 1839. Describing himself as 'a writer of books,' he urged that he had hitherto received little reward for his efforts, and that his works were likely to sell only when it was too late to benefit either himself or his family. He ended by asking the House to forbid 'persons, entirely unconcerned in this adventure of his, to steal from him his small winnings, for a space of sixty years at the shortest. After sixty years, unless your Honourable House provide otherwise, they may begin to steal.'

Therefore also Serjeant Talfourd introduced, in 1837, the first of his annual bills which sought to protect copyright for sixty years from the date of the author's death. These were either 'talked out' or rejected by the House from 1837 to 1841. In 1841 Talfourd, for the fifth and last time, brought

in his bill, when it had the sympathy of the majority of the House until Macaulay rose to speak. His speech, brilliant, delightful, lucid, and convincing, decided the fate of the bill, which was rejected by 45 votes to 38.

In the following year, 1842, the question was taken up by Lord Mahon, who later on became the fifth Earl Stanhope, and who had supported Talfourd in previous years. He introduced a bill which provided for copyright for the term of the author's life and a further period of twenty-five years. Macaulay again opposed this bill in Committee, but this time proposed an alternative scheme, which provided protection for the author's life or for forty-two years, whichever should be the longer period. As before, his speech carried the House, and his main contention was adopted, namely, that copyright should be reckoned from the date of publication, not from the date of the author's death. The Copyright Act of 1842 finally decided on a period of the author's life with a further seven years, or forty-two years after publication, whichever should be longer. The copyright was to vest in the author or his assignees. Provision was also made for dramatic and musical compositions. A similar act was passed for India in 1847, and until recently the law of the land has been based upon this bill.

A further stage in the development of copyright was marked by an international conference held at Berne in Switzerland. The conclusions arrived at in the Berne Convention of 1885-1887 were embodied in the International Copyright Act, which became law in 1886, and provided for the mutual recognition of copyright between Great Britain, the Colonies, and most continental nations. The United States refused to join the Convention, thereby prolonging a most unsatisfactory system, which permitted pirated and mutilated foreign reprints, until 1891, when reciprocal copyright became practically world-wide.

Copyright law, as it at present stands in England, is based upon the British Imperial Copyright Bill, which was introduced into Parliament in 1910 and was passed in 1911. It embodied the conclusions of a Board of Trade Committee and of an Imperial Conference, and was a Government measure. Protection was given during the life of the author and for fifty years after. All formalities of registration were abolished.



The interests of the public were safeguarded by a provision which laid down that if the owner of the copyright was not reasonable in the exercise of his rights and did not satisfy legitimate public needs, another person might be licensed to publish the work.

The history of copyright shows a gradual recognition by legislation of the right of an author to profit by his work, either in his own person, in the persons of his family by right of inheritance, or in the persons of his assignees by right of contract.

A second principle that emerges is the transfer of the principal interest in copyright from the author to the publisher. By the operation of the Copyright Act together with contract law, the copyright almost invariably is under the control of the author's assignees, namely, his publishers. On the whole, it was the influence of the publishers that ensured the passing of the recent bill. There is no trade which is better protected than the publishing trade, and it has been remarked that even before 1911 the bankruptcy of a publishing firm had been for long a most rare event.

The author benefits from the present long duration of copyright, however, by virtue of the modern royalty system. As a rule, nowadays the contract between an author and a publisher provides for the transfer of all pecuniary interest in a book from the author to the publisher (who undertakes the cost of publishing) subject to the condition that a certain agreed percentage of the receipts from all sales of the book, called the royalty, shall be paid over to the author or his heirs, as long as the copyright lasts.

## SPEECHES II AND V: PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION

Parliament, in its essence and in its origin, is a body of men summoned by the King to consult with him. Some members are summoned as individuals, some as representatives. Those who are summoned as representatives of a community were first nominated by the King or by his officer, a sheriff, and subsequently were chosen or elected by the community.

We may conveniently begin the history of representative parliamentary institutions in England at the year 1265, when Simon de Montfort, having rebelled successfully against

Henry III, created incidentally a true representative Parliament, including the two elements already mentioned. Bishops, earls, and barons, (Lords Spiritual and Temporal,) were summoned as individuals. Two knights from every shire and two citizens called burgesses from every borough were summoned as representatives of communities. They were, however, nominated, not elected.

In 1295 this rebel reform was adopted by Edward I, with the difference that the knights and burgesses were now elected by freeholders, not nominated. Parliament had now assumed its age-long constitution, and consisted of the Lords and elected Commons. It is true that the privilege of the franchise was not appreciated, that the 2s. a day paid by the borough to the burgesses was felt to be a grievous impost, and that the franchise might be conferred on a borough or taken away from it at the caprice of the King. The function of Parliament was declared by statute, in 1332, to be the redress of grievances, legislation, and the granting of subsidies.

In 1327 the knights and burgesses united in deliberation, and in 1340 the Lords and Commons definitely separated into two bodies meeting in different chambers.

In 1430 the franchise was restricted, and was now granted only to freeholders of property to the annual value of 40s., instead of all freeholders, in the election of the knights. Further, that evil condition of Parliament began under Henry VI which lasted until 1832. As the franchise was looked upon as an onerous duty, the boroughs fell into the hands of those who were interested in Parliament. Citizens, indeed, petitioned to have the franchise removed. Consequently most borough members came to be nominated by patrons or corporations, and 'nomination boroughs,' or 'rotten boroughs,' came into existence. It is true that the *spirit* of Parliament was sufficiently shown in the Civil War and in the Revolution of 1688. Its constitution and its powers were explicitly declared in the latter year, and a theory formulated. But none the less it had ceased to be truly representative of the nation. Both knights and burgesses had become largely nominated bodies, the knights by the nobles and the burgesses by patrons, by corporations, or by the Crown. The elections were largely controlled by bribery, and the members themselves were often amenable to bribery.



Parliament was no longer the voice of the people, nor was it a safeguard of its liberties, as Macaulay points out in his *Essays upon Chatham*. Public opinion, outside of Parliament, became the new safeguard, now more and more fully alive to the importance of its rights, more enlightened, and more informed by the publication of debates from 1771 onwards.

Parliament had indeed been changed in constitution, though not reformed, by the Union with Scotland in 1707 and with Ireland in 1801, and had become the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The reform of Parliament, therefore, became a pressing question. In 1770 Chatham already sounded a note of warning: 'Either the Parliament will reform itself from within, or be reformed with a vengeance from without.' And his son Pitt, from 1782 to 1785, proposed various measures of reform which were rejected, though he was able to point out that the Prince of Arcot in India nominated seven British members. Before the question came up again the excesses of the French Revolution had aroused a mistrust of 'progress' which stood in the way of reform, and which caused Pitt to stand aloof, and in the end to repress and coerce the movement towards liberty. In 1792 a political society, the Friends of the People, was formed to promote reform. One of its leaders was Grey, afterwards Earl Grey, who finally carried reform triumphantly in 1832. Grey brought forward a reform motion in 1793, and a reform bill in 1797. He sought to establish a household franchise in the boroughs, and to admit leaseholders as well as freeholders in the county franchise. The Society was ready to prove that 357 members were returned by 154 patrons, and 200 by towns of less than 100 electors. The bill was defeated by a large majority, reform and revolution being considered as practically synonymous, in spite of brilliant speeches from Fox and Erskine. In 1817 Sir F. Burdett recommenced the struggle. He proposed (as had the Duke of Richmond in 1780) universal suffrage. The numbers of the division, 106-0, showed the hopelessness of the cause within Parliament. From 1820 to 1830 Lord John Russell led the movement. Bills for the disfranchisement of notoriously corrupt boroughs, for enfranchising great towns hitherto unrepresented, like Leeds, Manchester, or Birmingham, for extending the vote, for punishing bribery, all were

defeated in the Commons or in the Lords, though all were moderate bills, unlike the drastic measures of previous reformers.

In the reign of William IV the contest between people and Parliament came to a head. The fact that there was, and had been for fifty years, such a contest was sufficient answer to that most unwise declaration of the Duke of Wellington in 1830 that the English Parliament could not be improved, and that 'the system of representation possessed the full and entire confidence of the country.' On the fall of the Duke's Government Earl Grey became Prime Minister, and made reform his first object. In 1831, in March, the Reform Bill was introduced by Lord John Russell. It was finally defeated in Committee. After extraordinary scenes in both Lords and Commons, Parliament was dissolved. In the new House the bill was again introduced, and passed the Commons, but was thrown out by the Lords. Popular riots of an almost revolutionary nature ensued in the country, and when the third Reform Bill was introduced it finally became law in June 1832, the Lords having been coerced by the threat to create reforming peers and so to ensure a majority.

The provisions of the Reform Act were as follows. First, with regard to the franchise, the borough franchise was bestowed upon £10 householders. Leaseholders and copyholders to the value of £10 and tenants to the value of £50, as well as freeholders, were entitled to vote in county constituencies. The representation was reconstructed. Fifty-six nomination boroughs, returning 111 members, were disfranchised, 30 boroughs lost one member each, and 2 lost two each. Twenty-two large towns, never before represented, received two members each, and 20 smaller towns received one member each. The counties were subdivided, and now received 159 members instead of 94.

By this Act the middle classes were admitted to power; but there remained the working classes, who as yet were unrepresented. The industrial revolution and the importance and intelligence of these classes rendered further extended franchise necessary, and this became the next question.

The working classes were dissatisfied with the results of the Act of 1832, and this dissatisfaction was aggravated by sufferings due to dear food and want of work. Their demands



were formulated by their leaders in a People's Charter, and the Chartist agitation became formidable, lasting from 1837 until 1848. Their chief demand was for radical political reform, including manhood suffrage. In 1848, therefore, Mr. Joseph Hume, member for Montrose, brought forward a resolution, after attending many public meetings and after presenting a large petition. He urged this resolution as a remedy for the Chartist agitation. It was moved on June 21, and ran as follows: 'That this House, as at present constituted, does not fairly represent the population, the property, or the industry of the country, whence has arisen great and increasing discontent in the minds of a large portion of the people; and it is therefore expedient, with a view to amend the national representation, that the elective franchise shall be so extended as to include all householders; that votes shall be taken by ballot; that the duration of Parliaments shall not exceed three years; and that the apportionment of members to population shall be made more equal.' It was in the debate upon this resolution that Disraeli made the speech reprinted in this collection, which the *Annual Register* describes as 'a speech of very felicitous effect.' Disraeli's unfailing dexterity and sarcasm, together with the vague but strongly worded opposition of Lord John Russell, who feared Chartism, overcame the weighty and earnest appeals of Hume and of Cobden, and the resolution was lost by 351 votes to 84. The same fate befell the same resolution every year until 1852. Chartism having died away, however, the necessity for further reform was recognised by various Governments. Bills were brought in by Russell in 1852 and 1854, by Disraeli in 1859, again by Russell in 1860, and by Gladstone in 1866. All were defeated. It was upon the last of these occasions that Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer in Russell's Ministry, made the great speech we are concerned with in this book, defending the bill upon its second reading. The bill proposed to fix the borough franchise at £7 rental, and the county franchise at £14 rental, and to grant the vote to lodgers paying £10 rental. A number of Liberals, led by Earl Grosvenor and Mr. Lowe, the member for Calne, spoken of in Gladstone's speech, seceded and formed the historic 'Cave of Adullam.' (Cf. for explanation of this phrase of Bright's, the Bible, 1st Book of Samuel, chap. xxii. 1, 2.)

This measure was to be supplemented by a subsequent bill providing for a redistribution of seats. The opposition demanded that this scheme should be presented simultaneously, and in their name Earl Grosvenor, on April 12, 1866, moved the following amendment: 'That this House, while ready to consider, with a view to its settlement, the question of Parliamentary Reform, is of opinion that it is inexpedient to discuss a bill for the reduction of the franchise in England and Wales until the House has before it the entire scheme contemplated by the Government for the amendment of the Representation of the People.'

The second reading was carried only by 318 votes to 313, and the bill was finally defeated in Committee. The Ministry resigned, and the defeat of the bill was followed by rioting and other demonstrations of public opinion. By a strange chance, therefore, the new Conservative Government of Lord Derby found itself forced to initiate and pass radical measures of reform, public opinion being again roused on the subject. Disraeli's famous 'leap in the dark,' his Reform Act of 1867, redistributed some 50 seats and enfranchised in the boroughs all householders and lodgers of £10 rental, and in the counties tenants of £12 annual value.

The next step in reform was to grant the franchise to the county constituencies on the same terms as to the boroughs. Proposals to this effect had been brought forward from 1851 onwards, but were all defeated. Further progress was delayed by the Conservatives, who were in power from 1874 to 1880. In 1884 Mr. Gladstone, now Prime Minister, introduced his Franchise Bill proposing uniform household franchise and lodger franchise in counties and boroughs alike. As in 1866, the Conservatives demanded his redistribution scheme before they would consider his reform of the franchise. A conference between Liberal and Conservative party leaders followed, and a compromise was arranged. Under the new redistribution scheme boroughs of under 15,000 inhabitants were merged into county constituencies, those of under 50,000 received one member each, large towns were sub-divided into two or more constituencies, and equal electoral districts established.

The Reform Acts of 1884-1885 extended the basis of representation as far as is consistent with the main theory of the



English constitution, namely, that there shall be no taxation without representation, and conversely no representation without taxation. It is this theory that stands in the way of Universal Manhood Suffrage, and limits the suffrage to those who have 'a stake in the country,' however small. And it is this theory that is the strongest argument of the advocates of Women's Suffrage. If we admit this theory of representation, we must also admit that women who possess property, or earn incomes, and pay taxes, should be entitled to vote. The argument has been admitted to some extent in England by the admission of women to the municipal vote and to municipal office, and in New Zealand, Australia, the United States, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, by partial or complete extension to them of parliamentary suffrage and even membership.

The first important advocate of Women's Suffrage was John Stuart Mill in his election address in 1865. The movement was continued by petitions and by bills introduced into Parliament, such as the Women's Disabilities Bills of 1870 and 1871, all of which were rejected, until 1906, when the agitation, like that which preceded the Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867, assumed a lawless and violent form, carried on by wide-spread and powerful organisations. The English theory of representation, then, is anti-égalitarian in that the suffrage is looked upon as the right, not of the citizen, but of the taxpayer. If Universal Suffrage is to come, it will be preceded, as Mill demanded in his *Representative Government* in 1861, by universal *direct* taxpaying and education. It is very improbable that advancing democracy will put into force Mill's further desire that intellect should be proportionately represented, beyond maintaining the present University constituencies. There are undoubted anomalies in the working of elections by constituencies, for the proportion of Liberal members to Unionist members never corresponds to the proportion of Liberal votes to Unionist votes actually cast in the elections. All the system ensures is that Parliament shall register the general balance of opinion in the electorate. No really satisfactory system has yet been evolved to obtain proportionate representation.

But the main reform is complete. Parliament was always more or less representative of the electorate. The Ministry

also, since 1832, has received or given up power at the bidding of the electorate. Those who have only individual claims to be summoned to Parliament, *i.e.* the House of Lords, have of late definitely given up their right to withstand the declared and reiterated will of the electorate, as indicated by their representatives in the Commons. And the electorate now includes practically all the men of the nation.

### SPEECH III: ARMAMENTS ✓

It would be interesting to trace the history of armies and of navies in Europe, from the Greek phalanx to the Roman legion; from the barbarous invading nations in arms, like the Huns, to the disciplined and highly organised conscript citizen armies of to-day; from the bows and arrows and the pikes of the English army of Edward III to the rifles and bayonets, the mighty artillery, and the aeroplanes of a modern army; from the picturesque, small, wooden ships of the roving Vikings to the great, grim, rushing battleship with its appalling engines of destruction. Yet we will better be prepared to read this speech of Cobden's if we confine our attention to those great principles which have necessitated armaments and directed their objective. Before the modern era, history presents to us mainly the spectacle of nations either migrating wholly or detaching masses in search of a new home, or of the dynastic monarch of a warlike race expanding his dominions at the expense of weaker or less highly organised peoples. The wars of modern Europe have been the result of more complicated motives. It is true that religious wars have been fought, as, for example, when all Europe armed for the Crusades and sought to found a Christian kingdom in Palestine, or when the king of Spain waged war with Protestant countries to maintain the Catholic religion. But the three great principles that emerge from the history of European wars are dynastic considerations, the rights of nationalities, and the balance of power, generally in combination and difficult to separate.

(1) Dynastic considerations have plunged Europe into war when the English kings sought to enforce hereditary claims to the throne of France in the Hundred Years' War, when the Bourbons fought to expand their family dominions,



when Napoleon III sought to ensure his dynasty by military glory, and perhaps to-day when William II of Germany would seem to have yielded to the pressure of a military clique and to have justified an autocratic monarchy by the sudden exigencies of national danger and the promise of national aggrandisement. A really national feeling of enmity has rarely, if ever, provoked war; but the right of a nationality to independent existence has been a just and frequent cause of an appeal to arms. In this spirit the Dutch resisted Spain, the English fleet put to flight the Spanish Armada, and the Swiss fought the Austrians.

(2) It was not until the French Revolution, when the French fought all Europe, which was at first in arms against the Revolution, that the principle of nationality vindicated itself finally against the principle of monarchical dynastic right. So Great Britain fought to maintain the independence of Spain and Portugal against the conquering Napoleon, so Napoleon III and English volunteers helped the Italians in their struggle for independence, and so also in 1914 it was finally the vindication of the rights of Belgium that united all parties in England in a common determination to crush the oppressor, Germany.

(3) The Balance of Power is a conception of importance throughout the modern period, though it may not have been formulated until the nineteenth century. At all times the peace and stability of Europe have been endangered by the preponderating power of one nation seeking to enforce its will upon others. From Charles V and Philip II of Spain in the sixteenth century, the Habsburgs of Spain and Austria and Louis XIV of France in the seventeenth, to Napoleon at the beginning, and Germany at the end, of the nineteenth, the civilised world has feared and resisted a possible Master-State. But the systematic and scientific maintenance of a European balance of power by diplomacy, by alliances, and if necessary by armed force, is a conception dating from the overthrow of Napoleon and the subsequent settlement of Europe by the Powers met together in the Congress of Vienna, in the first *Concert of Europe*, in 1814.

And the principle was so carried out in this all-powerful Congress as to balance the strength of France or Russia on the one side, with an aggrandised Austria and Prussia, with

Sweden strengthened by the annexation of Norway, and Holland by the annexation of Belgium, on the other. This 'vivisection of a continent,' as it has been called, neglected utterly the principle of nationality, and was fraught with wars to come. The somewhat mystical Holy Alliance between the three autocratic monarchs of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, necessarily carrying with them their creature, the French king, was declared to aim at a Confederation of Europe in the interests of peace, but in practice eventually confined itself to the maintenance of peace by the attempted suppression of dangerous liberal constitutions and the support of absolute monarchy. In this alliance, with these tendencies, England refused to join, and from 1830 the European Committee ceased to govern. The wars of nationality began again with the Belgian and Greek Wars of Independence, and the old tangle of national rivalries and fears was woven afresh.

In English foreign policy the Manchester School and the School of Palmerston represent the two rival tendencies of this time. Lord Palmerston was Foreign Secretary at various times from 1831 until 1865. He was devoted to the principles of the balance of power, of nationality, and of liberal institutions, and was prepared to support these principles abroad, and to assert the prestige of England, by diplomatic and armed intervention upon every occasion. And the occasions were frequent.

The long enmity between England and France came to an end for a time when the two countries united to support constitutional government in Spain and Portugal in 1833. France having become, after the revolution of 1830, a parliamentary monarchy, and generally they stood together against Prussia, Austria, and Russia, the three great absolute monarchies. Yet their formal alliance in 1835 was called by Wellington a 'cardboard alliance,' and a rupture began on the Egyptian question. The rebellion of Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, against Turkey, was settled by the Powers. France and England worked together at first, but disagreed upon the terms, and finally Palmerston agreed upon terms with the other Powers, without consulting France, and enforced them without her help in 1840. The quarrel was patched up by the Governments, but public opinion was unappeased, and in 1846 the affair of the Spanish Marriages, in which Louis



Philippe sought to aggrandise his family by marrying French princes to the Queen and an Infanta of Spain, ended the good understanding between the countries. In 1848, the year of general revolutions in Europe, Palmerston showed his sympathy, though without practical effect, with the insurgents in Hungary, Italy, and France, and in 1852 he signified his approval of the *coup d'état* of Napoleon III. In 1850 and in 1857 his aggressive policy against Greece and China respectively called down censure upon him, and in 1853 the country, in alliance with France, was involved in war in support of Turkey against Russia, in the Crimea. His intervention on behalf of Poland and of Schleswig-Holstein in 1863 ended in mere bluster, and only incensed Russia and Prussia. From 1859 onwards he remained neutral during the wars between France, Austria, and Italy, but the tendency to regard France as an enemy was again shown as in 1851 in increased fortifications on the South Coast. War was narrowly averted with the Northern States of America in 1863 over the *Trent* affair.

Such was the policy of the School of Palmerston. The Manchester School of Liberals, of whom Cobden and Bright were the most notable representatives, were in all things opposed to any policy which would involve war, and sought to further a federation of nations upon principles of good-will and morality. Their advocacy of free-trade was not merely an economic policy, for they looked upon it as an essential step towards international federation. They lamented the economic loss resulting from armaments and warfare. They concentrated their attention upon domestic affairs, and desired to leave other nations to work out their own salvation, despite the claims of small nationalities, of constitutionalism, or of international justice. They were led, as a reaction against Palmerston's aggressiveness, into a policy of absolute non-intervention, and they advocated an appeal to arbitration in the case of international disputes. Such, then, were the principles which animated Cobden in his speech of 1851, when he protested against the steady increase of armaments directed against France.

Apart from the general and prevailing mistrust of France, a legacy from many centuries of war, and the outstanding differences upon the Eastern Question, immediate cause for anxiety lay in the alarming Revolution of 1848 and in its

results. The great French Revolution had ended in the establishment of a military Empire under Napoleon I, and already in 1851 it seemed clear that history was about to repeat itself. Louis Napoleon, a nephew of the Emperor, had been elected President of the new Republic in 1848, and three years later his assumption of imperial power, based on the popular vote, was seen to be imminent. English statesmen, therefore, only responded to a general feeling of alarm in taking measures of protection against the possible onslaughts of a new Napoleonic Empire.

Such principles as those of the Manchester School may easily degenerate into a cowardly worship of mere economic welfare, and the pacifist may be led into a fool's paradise wherein he lies at the mercy of a strongly armed and unscrupulous State. But the events of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have proved that Cobden was right on the whole. The organisation of all European nations into vast armed camps, the immeasurable burdens of their armaments, the headlong race for military and naval supremacy, hastened by commercial and colonial rivalries, have ended at last in the most appalling war in all history. The Balance of Power, which called into being the Triple Entente to control the Triple Alliance, has once more proved to be unable to maintain peace, and to be a principle that provokes war rather than renders it impossible. And the erection of warfare into a duty, of armed might into a philosophic principle, calls imperiously for some other ideal in which men may seek inspiration. The gospel of peace cannot be practised by any one State, but demands such a federation of States as Cobden desired, which shall all be determined to submit all quarrels to international arbitration and to maintain only such armaments as are necessary to enforce, in the name of the federation, its decisions and its laws.

#### SPEECH IV : SLAVERY AND SECESSION

Slavery has existed in all ages and in many forms, as a necessary appanage of a martial race, as a means of utilising captives taken in war, or as a more or less paternal and protective system under an aristocracy. It existed among the Romans and Greeks, and was considered just, politically



expedient, and economically profitable. The rights of men, as distinguished from the rights of citizens, are a modern conception, partly of Christian origin, and formed the fundamental principle of the French Revolution. It is, however, modern European civilisation, professedly Christian, that furnishes the history of the most barbaric perhaps of all systems of slavery, and which employed its power and organisation in the systematic trade in human beings. And of that modern nation which is theoretically the most attached to free institutions, one half seceded and fought to the death in defence of this system. From 1442 onwards the Portuguese, then the chief maritime power, fitted out ships to capture African negroes and to transport them into Spain to be sold there. They built forts and founded 'factories' on the West Coast of Africa. The descendants of these slaves were the first to be carried into the Spanish colonies in the New World, especially Haiti, to be employed in the mines. In 1517 Charles V, Emperor, and King of Spain, granted one of his subjects a monopoly of the slave-trade, with the right to export annually 40,000 negroes, supplied by the Portuguese, to Haiti, Cuba, and Jamaica.

The English joined in the trade from 1562 onwards, when Sir John Hawkins, among other piratical exploits, robbed Portuguese slave-ships. With the foundation of Virginia a large market was opened for the English slave-trade in the tobacco plantations. The monopoly of the trade was granted to the African Company, which was even aided by grants from Parliament, until 1688, when the trade was declared open. From 1680 to 1700, 140,000 were exported by the African Company and 160,000 by other traders. From 1700 to 1786 610,000 were exported to Jamaica, a British colony since 1655, and from 1680 to 1786, 2,130,000 into British American colonies alone, the export increasing until about 1790 it averaged 75,000 annually.

European, Arab, and Moorish slave-dealers devastated West Africa, the Soudan, and the Upper Nile regions. The track of their caravans was marked by scattered bones of the dead. Armed themselves, ravaging and burning as they went, they armed and paid African chiefs also to join in the evil work and to betray their own people. To these horrors on land were added further horrors at sea, when the slaves

were transported to America. Over 12 per cent died on the voyage, and not 50 per cent survived their 'apprenticeship.' Early in the eighteenth century opposition arose in England. In 1772 the courts of law, in the famous case of the negro Somerset, decided that a slave became free as soon as he entered England, and in 1776 Mr. Hartley introduced a motion into the House of Commons to the effect 'that the slave-trade is contrary to the law of God and the rights of man.' The sect of the Quakers, whose founder, George Fox, more than a hundred years before had protested against the trade, was active in opposition both in England and in America, and founded Anti-slavery Societies. In 1786 Clarkson's Cambridge Prize Essay *On the Slavery and Commerce of Human Beings* roused William Wilberforce, the apostle of abolition, to form, with Zachary Macaulay and other influential men, a committee. Petitions and motions were put forward in Parliament. In 1788 Pitt himself moved for consideration of the question, and from 1789 to 1791 a Committee of the whole House took evidence, at the end of which a motion to prevent further export into British colonies was lost by 80 votes, though supported by Pitt, Fox, and Burke. In 1792 an amended resolution, originally moved by Wilberforce, providing for gradual abolition, the trade to cease in 1796, was carried, but was postponed by the Lords, who further obstructed all progress until 1806. Grenville and Fox, being then in office, abolished the British slave-trade for foreign supply, and in 1807 the General Abolition Act put an end to all British slave-trade. Contraband traders violated the law frequently until, in 1811, Brougham's Act declared their offence to be a felony punishable by transportation. Other European nations followed Britain's example in 1814, when the Congress of Vienna, which met upon the fall of Napoleon, decided upon a general and gradual abolition of the trade. British cruisers swept the seas in search of traders, as they do to this day, enforcing this decision.

The slave-trade being thus abolished, the next object of philanthropic reform was the abolition of slavery itself. The arguments in its favour were reinforced by the aggravated horrors of the contraband trade, and the miseries of the remaining and over-worked slaves; but the opposition of strong vested interests was encountered. The first object



of the Anti-slavery Society, founded in 1823, was the better treatment of slaves; but, finding half-measures useless, they pressed for entire abolition. The agitation continued until 1833, when the labours of Wilberforce, Clarkson, and Zachary Macaulay bore full fruit. Earl Grey being in office, Mr. Stanley introduced the Government Bill for the abolition of colonial slavery, which became law. The Act provided that all slave children born after 1827 should be freed at once, and all other slaves after seven years, their status in the meantime to be one of paid apprenticeship, and that compensation to the amount of £20,000,000 should be paid to the slave-owners. Other European Powers followed suit, and the gradual extension of colonies and protectorates in Africa has practically put an end to surviving slavery within Africa, in Turkey, Arabia, and Persia.

There remained the momentous question of slavery in the United States. The Northern States passed abolition separately at various times between 1777 and 1804, in accordance with the theories and desires of great Americans like Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson; but economic considerations and vested interests prevailed in the more conservative cotton-growing Southern States. It was impossible that it should remain an academic question, though each State had the constitutional right to decide in the matter for itself. Difficulties regarding new States, and a generally aggressive policy on both sides divided the United States into two parties, resulted in grievous friction, and ended in civil war between North and South. The Fugitive Slave Law was enforced in the South with great severity after 1850, and Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, issued in 1852, moved public opinion deeply. The question whether Kansas, a new State, should be a free State or a slave State produced a localised disturbance amounting to civil war from 1854 to 1857. John Brown, a fanatical abolitionist, was executed in 1859, after he had made a raid into Kansas, with the object of rousing the negroes to rebellion, and he was looked upon as a martyr to the cause. Finally, the election of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States in 1860 gave the signal for secession and civil war. The Southern States found themselves in a minority in the Federal Congress, and seceded from the Union as the only way of maintaining their undoubted



rights. In February 1861 delegates from the various 'state conventions' of the Southern States met and founded the Confederate States, elected Jefferson Davis as their President, and declared in their Constitution that 'the institution of negro slavery, as it now exists in the Confederate States, shall be recognised and protected by Congress.' The Federal States of the North thereupon went to war with the Confederate States of the South to enforce the Union and the abolition of slavery, and the great American Civil War ended in 1865 in the triumph of the North. Already in 1863 Lincoln had issued a proclamation emancipating the slaves in the Southern States, and at the end of the war the law was ratified which abolished and prohibited slavery throughout the United States.

Mr. John Bright more than any man brought home the real significance of the secession of the Southern States to the English people, namely, its relation to slavery. They made the mistake of applying 'ordinary political maxims to what was not merely a political contest, but a social revolution' (Morley, *Life of Gladstone*). Much as Gladstone hated slavery, he held that the South was within its rights and that coercion by the North must fail. Cobden sided with the Free-trade South against the Protectionist North, until his friend Bright converted him to his own opinion. In 1861 a Northern naval officer boarded a British mail-steamer, the *Trent*, and removed Confederate officers out of her, and this affair greatly exasperated public feeling. The great cotton trade, further, was carried on mainly between Lancashire and the Southern States, and the war, in which the Northern States were the aggressors, produced a cotton famine and great distress in Lancashire. Bright fought from the first the cause of the North. Already in 1861, after the *Trent* affair, he addressed his friends at a banquet at Rochdale, the city in Lancashire which Cobden represented in Parliament, indicating the meaning of the conflict and the position of the North. He found a considerable majority in the House of Commons resigned to, or anxious for, the break-up of the United States, and willing to recognise the Confederate States. He therefore addressed himself mainly to the people, and sought to educate public opinion, with great effect. On February 3, 1863, a large meeting was held in the Public Hall of Rochdale.

to pass resolutions of thanks to the New York merchants for their contributions sent to the distressed cotton operatives of Lancashire. On this occasion Bright made the speech included in this book. Again in March he spoke at a great meeting of working men in London, when he insisted that slavery involved a degraded conception of labour, and that working men could not remain neutral in the conflict. In June, when a motion for the recognition of the Confederate States was debated in Parliament, Bright's wonderful speech undid the harm wrought by Gladstone's vague and irresolute declarations. Recognition at that stage would have involved war, of which there was considerable danger. Had Great Britain declared war the blockade of the Southern States by the Northern Navy would have been raised, the export of cotton resumed, and the miseries of Lancashire relieved at once. Yet the working people of Lancashire declared their desire that justice should prevail, even though it meant continued starvation to them. It was due to their nobility and to the personal influence of John Bright that America was left to work out her own salvation, and that England was saved from helping to perpetuate the evils of slavery and from maintaining the vested interests of a reactionary aristocratic caste of slave-owners.

#### SPEECH VI: EDUCATION

The ancient Hindu caste system of social education furnishes perhaps the best illustration of the main aspect of Froude's educational theories, for the aim of the whole system is to prepare the child to make his living by ensuring to him the mastery of a trade, and to ensure it further to him by restricting his views to that one particular walk of life. There is a considerable analogy between this and the mediaeval and modern European system of guilds and apprenticeship, and there is a very great deal to be urged in favour of such systems, though they undoubtedly restrict the birthright of those subject to them and tend to exclude them from the more purely intellectual activities which are the highest privileges of man.

Moreover, such has been for many centuries the divorce between the practical education and the intellectual education of Europe that such systems would hardly be admitted to



be true education. The Greeks perhaps first conceived the notion of an education which aimed consciously at purely intellectual and moral development, a *liberal* education in which music and literature developed the mind, and gymnastics the body, to a harmonious perfection. And in Sparta the whole State was organised with a view to this object, and with a view especially to social education. In Rome the chief instrument of education, rhetoric, had a distinct practical application, for it qualified the scholar for success in practical life, as a lawyer, an orator, a politician, or a teacher. In the Middle Ages, however, the separation between liberal education and practical education became definite, when all instruments of culture became subservient to Christian theology. Study and intellectual training were carried on within the limits of doctrinal authority, and logic, for example, became an end, not a means, in Scholasticism. And it was by controlling education that the Church obviated the dilemma between 'the liberal education which you may get by sending your children to the public schools, or the salvation of their souls which you may secure by sending them to the monks.' The studies which the Church encouraged in this spirit have dominated until recently the great educational systems of Europe.

Yet the Church rendered great service in the preservation of literature and the continuity of study, and in the foundation of educational institutions and libraries. Cathedral and monastic schools, at first intended for the training of priests, developed purposes of general education, and expanded into universities or corporations of masters and students, which received charters involving privileges from popes or monarchs, as did the University of Paris in 1180, and those of Oxford and Cambridge early in the thirteenth century.

The separation of this system from practical life was shown partly by its theological and moral aim, and partly by the strange medley of scholars, many of them vagrant and even mendicant. Yet this vagrancy of students and the migration of teachers from country to country and from university to university was the sign of the true cosmopolitanism of the intellect in those days.

In the fourteenth century a new movement began, which made great changes in the spirit of education. The revival of



classical studies, of original Latin and Greek masterpieces of literature and philosophy, no longer connected with theology, began in Italy and spread from there. A new spirit of independent inquiry arose, which manifested itself in the Protestant Reformation, in the thought of Bacon and Galileo, and was vastly stimulated by the discoveries of the great voyagers, in particular the Discovery of the New World of America. The materials for such study and the results of these inquiries were multiplied by the new art of printing books.

The Middle Ages were necessary for the organisation of society in general and of educational institutions in particular, under the shelter of authority which left men's activities free for constructive work. The Renaissance, which substituted Humanism for Theology as an ideal, was necessary as criticism preparatory to progress, and it broadened the basis and liberalised the spirit of thought and of education.

Consequently the authority of the Church began to wane, though it has remained powerful until the present century. In the reign of Henry VIII the secularisation of church property led to the disappearance of many Church schools. New schools were founded on a secular basis by Edward VI and Elizabeth, the great Grammar Schools and Public Schools, and new colleges were formed out of the dissolution of the monasteries at Oxford and Cambridge. Regius professorships, endowed in the same way, tended to ensure the independence and the stability of instruction there.

Neither at school nor at the universities was education intended or adapted for practical life. Such as it was then, almost purely literary and classical, so it remained until late in the nineteenth century, until after Froude's speech at St. Andrews. It prepared a scholar only for the priesthood or for a literary profession. When the enthusiasm of the Renaissance died away, when political, economic, industrial, and scientific preoccupations gradually absorbed men's minds, this narrow humanistic culture, more and more out of touch with the life of the nation, degenerated into a mere formal discipline, even as the logic of Scholasticism had degenerated, having served its purpose. And it was essentially aristocratic.

In the seventeenth century already we find dissatisfaction expressed with the prevailing system, both because of its aristocratic nature and its unpracticality. The demand was then

already made for universal elementary schools, for elementary trade schools, and for a college of research. But it was not until the French Revolution had propagated an entirely new conception of society that educational reform became possible. The French Revolution, insisting on the rights of all men, insisted logically also on the right of every child to be educated and to be prepared by education for practical life. Education was no longer looked upon as the privilege of the rich, as a dedication to studious poverty, or as an intellectual ornament, nor was it admitted to be the preserve of the Churches.

The main factors in the history of education in England in the nineteenth century are the gradual extension of education to the whole nation and its adaptation to a new order of civilisation. Nor have these two main reforms been completed without strong opposition from reactionary conservatism and privileged ecclesiasticism.

In England the extension of elementary education was at first the work of the Church and of private Societies founded for the purpose, such as the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society, which built and maintained schools throughout the country, from 1811 onwards. In the end, these private organisations were found to be inadequate. By 1818 only one child in four was receiving any education. The teaching, moreover, was extremely inefficient. Consequently it became necessary that the State should first supplement, then absorb and replace this system of charitable education. In 1833 the first grant was made in aid, and in 1839 an official educational authority was appointed. The grants increased from £20,000 in 1833 to nearly £700,000 in 1858, and were dependent on examination after 1862.

In 1870 a national system of universal education was established under Gladstone's Government by Forster's Elementary Education Act. The whole country was divided into districts. School-boards were set up with the power to levy rates and found schools where needed, and with the option of enforcing attendance from the ages of 6 to 14. This system co-ordinated the existing schools with the new Board-schools. In 1880 education under this scheme was made compulsory, and in 1891 was made free. The secondary endowed schools, public schools, and universities, were largely reorganised and made more accessible to the many after the reports of Royal



Commissions of inquiry between 1850 and 1880. In 1888 the establishment of County Councils furnished a new possible basis of administration, and in 1889 these were empowered to levy a rate in order to establish technical schools. The School-boards did not work satisfactorily, being narrow and parochial, and aiming at cheapness. Bryce's Commission in 1894 recommended the transference of educational authority altogether to the County Councils. This was enacted by the great Education Act of Mr. Balfour in 1902, and the School-boards were abolished. The County Councils took over control of the Board-schools and the Higher Grade Schools, as well as, to a limited extent, of the voluntary schools, co-ordinated their organisation, and founded new elementary and secondary schools. The 'educational ladder' was a new conception which this Act put into full practice. Elementary education was extended to the poorest, and a generous provision of competitive scholarships enabled any exceptional boy, despite poverty, to proceed from elementary to secondary school, and thence to a university. The highest education is thus, on the whole, open not only to the rich but also to no small proportion of the intelligent poor.

With regard to the second great problem of education, the schools and universities have been slow in responding to the needs of the new age of democracy and industrialism. There was long a vague fear of putting the weapon of knowledge in the hands of the lower classes, and a desire to keep the mob in its place. Macaulay, illiberally but wisely, desired on the contrary the spread of education as a means of checking popular agitation in England. This anti-democratic attitude not only obstructed for long universal education, but it also maintained a purely aristocratic and unpractical system of studies. Until the second half of the nineteenth century the popular elementary schools taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, and no more, nor did they lead to any further studies. The secondary endowed schools, as the Commission of 1864 showed, kept to the ancient curriculum of Latin and Greek grammar and composition, and at the best supplied the universities with a limited number of classical scholars. As for the moral and physical training they furnished, Wellington's famous dictum, 'The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton,' must surely praise equally the village school

and the village green. The universities also, absorbed in a narrow humanitarian curriculum, remained in a sort of back-water far from the main current of the age.

Technical, scientific, and commercial education was therefore carried on apart from the universities and other traditional educational authorities by the State. A College of Chemistry, a School of Mines, and a Training College, were founded by Government, as well as military and naval Colleges. The Department of Science and Art, founded in 1853, encouraged instruction of this nature, and the Mechanics' Institutes and the City and Guilds Institute, both private organisations, furthered the movement. The technical institutes of the County Councils and the new Universities and University Colleges of the great industrial towns set up entirely new curricula which prepared their students for definite trades and professions, and which have for some time now been gradually forcing their way into the older universities and public schools. The opening of the Civil Services to all comers by competitive examination since 1870 gave a practical aim to the higher education of the upper classes also. A 'modern side' was established in public schools. All secondary schools of the modern type provide scientific as well as literary training, and give facilities for preparation for the special industry of the district, for manual and physical instruction, and for games. The elementary schools, further, prepare for higher education, and extend their instruction beyond the three R's to include history, geography, literature, and elementary science. The physical welfare of the child is also cared for by physical exercise, by medical inspection and attention, and by the provision of food and conveyances where necessary.

On the whole, then, Froude's ideal is on its way to realisation in England, and neither an Oxford education nor any other type of education is now adapted or intended only to prepare a man 'for the trade of gentleman.'

## PART II

### ORATORY AND THE ORATORS

The fact that five out of the six orators represented in this volume are politicians shows that the chief field of oratory



is politics. It is in Parliament and in political campaigns in the country that oratory has developed and had its greatest influence. Four of these speeches were delivered in Parliament, and both the others, though neither was a distinctly party speech, had an immediate bearing upon political questions of the time. The clergyman, it is true, still seeks to enforce religious truths and morality in orations from the pulpit; but the great divines who were also orators belong to a bygone age. Literary lecturers no longer tour England and America, reaping a harvest from their oratory. The professor seeks rather to instruct than to inspire, and the great lawyer is a logician and a debater, and seldom has recourse to ornate or emotional rhetoric. In politics almost alone to-day does a speaker seek to sway his audience by the power of his personality and by the art of oratory.

And even in politics much of the glory has departed. The day of spoken literature seems to be past, in private society and in public alike. Private conversation and parliamentary oratory must consist mainly of debate, or the listeners become inattentive and melt away. We no longer have patience for a leisurely exposition of a subject, treated with a wealth of illustration; and with the change in the type of audience most common, and in the practical nature of their interests, the result of a new type of education, that literary flavour which is so delightful in Macaulay's speeches has ceased to charm and is no longer sought after. The vast increase of parliamentary business, also, and its complicated nature, demand expeditious treatment, and curtail debates.

Of the many reasons which have rendered oratory less practically *effective*, moreover, the development of the party system in politics and the ever-increasing severity of party discipline is perhaps the most notable. No more does the House fill as it once did when the word went round, 'Macaulay is up,' merely to enjoy the literary rhetoric of an individual orator. Rarely, moreover, does an orator enjoy such a personal triumph over party machinations as that which I once saw in France, when M. Briand dominated a universal tempest in the French Chamber. The orator is greeted and applauded mainly as the leader or spokesman of a party. Individuality and personality, the essence of the art of oratory, as of all art, have little scope to-day, and the individualist

in politics is generally soon eliminated from Parliament by the powerful party organisations. Finally, it is a matter of opinion whether debates in Parliament to-day ever decide the fate of a division. The party Whip, the adjutant of the regiment of members belonging to his party, is more important in practical politics to-day than the finest orator the party can count among its numbers. For this and for other reasons a single speech, or a series of speeches from an individual member, perhaps never again can influence Parliament in such a way as did Macaulay's speech in 1841 in the debate upon the Copyright Bill, when, as we have seen, he reversed entirely the probable decision of the House. It is to be noticed also that an air of unreality is imparted to much parliamentary oratory of to-day by the fact that the audience really aimed at is not present, but will *read* the speech in next morning's newspaper. The speaker often does not deliver an oration, but only reads, as a necessary formality, a political article for publication in the press.

On the whole, Parliament has become a business committee, demanding purely practical merits in its discussions. Political oratory now flourishes mainly in 'the country' as distinguished from the Houses, in political campaigns such as Gladstone's 'Midlothian Campaign' in 1879-1880, or Chamberlain's Tariff Reform pilgrimage in 1903, or in the flood-tide of a General Election.

THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY, afterwards Baron Macaulay of Rothley, (1800-1859) was the son of Zachary Macaulay, a man of liberal ideas who took a leading part in the agitation against the slave-trade, and he naturally joined the Whig party, becoming one of its ministers in Parliament and its apologist in his writings. He began his career as a writer with his famous article on Milton in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1825, was called to the bar in 1826, and entered Parliament in 1830.

As a man of letters his great reputation rests on his collected *Essays*, published in 1843, his *History of England*, two volumes of which appeared in 1848 and two more in 1855, and his *Lays of Ancient Rome*, a collection of spirited historical ballads published in 1842. The amazing popularity of these works, the brilliance of their style, and his greatness as an historian



were rewarded by considerable wealth and by a peerage bestowed in 1857.

As a lawyer his extraordinary memory, thoroughness, and skill in debate brought him distinction. He was sent to India in 1834 as legal member of Council, and took a large part in framing the Indian Penal Code. He further ensured, before he left in 1838, the adoption of a western system of education as a Government policy.

In Parliament he obtained a reputation as an orator by his speeches on the Reform Bills of 1830-1832, and received office as Secretary to the Board of Control (corresponding to the present India Office). From 1839 to 1841 he was Secretary for War, and from 1846 to 1847 Paymaster of the Forces. He was elected as member for Edinburgh in 1839. Defeated there in 1847, he was recalled in triumph in 1852 and remained an ornament to Parliament and to the city that honoured its distinguished representative until 1856, when he retired from politics.

Macaulay seldom intervened in purely party debates, but reserved his efforts for occasions when he felt deeply upon a subject, or was particularly qualified by special knowledge. So in 1843 he denounced Lord Ellenborough, and made his recall from India inevitable. So also he obtained the rejection of Talfourd's Copyright Bill in 1841, and the passing of his own measure in 1842. The influence of his speeches was shown not only in their effect upon Parliament, but also in the impressions of reporters and other listeners.

He was not an orator in the sense of possessing an attractive or dramatic manner; his voice was monotonous, and in general his delivery had little to do with the success of his speeches. Nor had he the gift of extemporaneous oratory. His speeches had the merits of his essays, trenchant, brilliant with antithesis, epigram, and sarcasm, carefully prepared, written, and mainly committed to memory. Out of the vast storehouse of his reading he adorned his thoughts with historical and literary allusions and illustrations, imparting a literary flavour to his speeches which makes them as delightful to read to-day as they were to hear when the House of Commons, that fastidious judge of oratory, listened attentively to every word. If we add to this literary excellence the vehement dogmatism of his thought, and the authority which he not

only assumed, but which was conceded to his distinguished attainments and character, we shall understand the extent of his influence on the few occasions when he intervened in debate.

BENJAMIN DISRAELI, afterwards Earl of Beaconsfield, (1804–1881) of Jewish family, was the son of Isaac d'Israeli. ('Knock out the apostrophe,' said he in 1837; 'it looks so foreign.') His father was the author of some well-known volumes of *Curiosities of Literature*, and other works, and Disraeli, also, attained literary distinction as a novelist of society before he set out on his meteoric political career. He continued writing novels at intervals throughout his life. Of his early novels, *Vivian Grey* was prophetic, for it described a brilliant and unscrupulous young adventurer in search of social fortune. And the later novels, such as *Sybil*, are deeply imbued with his political views. His novels show him as he was, an Oriental, picturesque, dramatic, even theatrical, a political adventurer, with a definite political faith, determined to succeed, and possessing enough moral and intellectual strength to ensure ultimate success, despite all the forces of conventionality. In 1832 already, after his first defeat as a candidate for Parliament, when Lord Melbourne asked him what were his wishes, he replied, 'I want to be Prime Minister,' and in 1837, when returned as Conservative member for Maidstone, upon the failure of his maiden speech in the House, he asserted, 'I have always succeeded at last . . . the time will come when you will hear me.' This wish and this prophecy were both fulfilled.

His support was early in request. At first a supporter of Peel, he changed sides, devoted himself to the task of reorganising the Tory party, and created the new Conservative democratic party, which replaced the old aristocratic Toryism, and whose ideals were Imperialism and practical domestic reform. The recognised leader of this powerful party, he opposed Palmerston and fought his long duel with Gladstone, the leader of the new Liberal party. He became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Derby in 1852, and again in 1867, carrying his great Reform Bill, and in 1868, on the retirement of Derby, he at last realised his ambition and became Prime Minister. He was forced to resign later in the year,



but returned to office in 1874, and remained in power until 1880. He maintained an aggressive foreign policy, and combated the Liberal tendency to undervalue the importance of the colonies. He was created Earl of Beaconsfield in 1876, and the summit of his political career was attained when he attended the Congress of Berlin, called to settle the Near-Eastern question of Turkey and Russia, and returned 'with peace and honour.' The Liberals were returned to office in 1880 under Gladstone; Disraeli resigned, and died in the following year.

As a speaker he was widely different from Macaulay. His speeches were not the somewhat detached incursions of a man of letters into the political arena. Each was a shot fired in party warfare, and each bears the trace of political exigency. Disraeli was, moreover, a man of overpowering personality, with a remarkable imagination and dramatic instinct, and these characteristics overflowed in his speeches. Imperturbable and impassive always, he was a terrible enemy in debate, a master of cold passion, of sardonic irony, of witty ridicule, a 'master of gibes and flouts and jeers,'<sup>1</sup> of felicitous and stinging phrase and epigram. His qualities as an orator were on the whole those of a consummate destructive debater, and they were heightened by his picturesque and carefully studied dress and appearance, and by the strange fascination of the pale, expressionless mask of his face. Yet he commanded also a deeper note, all the more impressive because it was rarely sounded by him in the ceaseless turmoil of political strife. His noble tribute to the dead Cobden, for example, shows us a different Disraeli altogether.

RICHARD COBDEN (1804-1865) was the first notable representative in Parliament of the commercial middle classes of England. He was a commercial traveller for a cotton firm before setting up, in 1830, a very successful business of his own in Lancashire. But early in life Cobden felt it his duty to devote himself to politics, and abandoned a commercial career which would certainly have brought him great wealth and comfort. His inattention to business indeed brought him to poverty, and in 1846 and again in 1860 he was rescued from distress by the subscriptions of his friends and admirers.

<sup>1</sup> A famous phrase applied by Disraeli himself to Lord Salisbury.

His political faith became the creed of what is known as the Manchester School of Liberals, of which he and Bright were the leaders. He preached the doctrines of peace, non-interference, retrenchment in public expenditure, and free trade, all calculated to further the domestic and commercial welfare of the country, to which he subordinated all questions of foreign or colonial policy. He is chiefly important in political history as the Apostle of Free Trade.

The Anti-Corn-Law League, founded at Manchester in 1838, took the place of a former ineffective Association and organised the work of obtaining the repeal of the Corn Laws which imposed a protective duty upon wheat imported into the country, and of furthering the principle of free trade in general. Cobden soon became one of the leaders in the movement, both by his speeches and by his genius for political agitation and for organisation. He entered Parliament in 1841 and was largely instrumental in winning over Sir Robert Peel to the cause, by whom the Corn Laws were finally repealed in 1846.

Having thus attained the main object of his exertions, he spent the rest of his parliamentary career in maintaining the other principles which he professed, opposing war even in the teeth of fevered public opinion, advocating a reduction of armaments, negotiating a commercial treaty with France in 1860, supporting the cause of the North in the American Civil War; one of the most distinguished Members of Parliament who was never a Minister, for he steadily refused office.

Whatever the merits or the faults of his political doctrines, whether Liberal theories and commercialism led him aright or led him astray, he is one of the most respectable figures in political history, and he brought a new and powerful element into importance in Parliament, for Manchester Liberalism overcame and replaced effete Whiggism. Even his political opponents will aver that what he lacked in vision he made up for in earnestness and political probity.

Cobden's first speech in Parliament, says Lord Morley in his biography, 'sounded a new key, and startled men by an accent that was strange in the House of Commons, . . . the rare tone of reality, and the note of a man dealing with things and not words.' He spoke as befitted a political philosopher, with calm and confidence, adducing facts, persuading reasonably, detached from party politics, with all the weight that



comes of personal conviction, relying constantly upon practical wisdom and appealing to common sense. It was due to his influence, far greater in the House of Commons than Bright's, that the cause of free trade triumphed in Parliament, and Peel, with universal applause, declared this conviction, praising Cobden's appeals 'to reason, expressed by an eloquence the more to be admired because it was unaffected and unadorned.'

JOHN BRIGHT (1811-1889) was the son of a prosperous Quaker mill-owner of Rochdale in Lancashire. Being a Quaker, or a member of the Society of Friends, he advocated a policy of peace, and when he entered upon public life he found himself the natural ally in this, as in all respects, of Cobden. Born and bred in Liberal principles, from the age of twenty onwards he spent his life in the active propagation of his convictions, and was one of the most notable of those men of the middle classes who, in Disraeli's mocking phrase, had discovered and followed the 'new profession' of political agitation, and who desired to substitute a Liberal middle-class Government for aristocratic Whig or Tory Governments. He was active in the Reform movement of 1831-1832, became one of the leaders of the Anti-Corn-Law League, entered Parliament as member for Durham in 1844, and subsequently represented Manchester and Birmingham. Viewed at first with mistrust in Parliament as a demagogue, his admirable character and powerful oratory won him respect and influence, and he was a Minister in the various administrations of Gladstone from 1868 onwards. Already, in 1866, he was looked upon as the true author of Gladstone's Reform measures, and the compelling and inspiring power behind the Ministry. He supported Cobden's campaign against war and armaments in every emergency, in Parliament and in the provinces. And in the American crisis Bright almost alone stood firm from the first (when even Cobden was misled) in support of the North, and largely by his individual efforts changed the trend of public opinion.

It may be urged against both Bright and Cobden, the great Liberals of the Manchester School, that their political ideals were narrow inasmuch as they were based upon exclusively middle-class conceptions. The Factory Acts met with Bright's condemnation, and he had little sympathy with the

aspirations of democracy. Yet the Manchester School opened the way and laid the foundations of the road upon which a Liberal democracy has since marched to power. Beyond all doubt Bright especially, and Cobden, were the great educators of public opinion, and the political and administrative genius of Gladstone reaped for the new Liberal Party the harvest that they had sown.

Bright rose rapidly to fame as an orator. Already in his early days as an agitator, 'John Bright of Rochdale,' in his peculiar Quaker garments, always drew vast audiences, and his influence in 'the country' was greater than Cobden's. He had all the passion, the moral fervour, the impressiveness, that make a great popular orator. He had, moreover, remarkable powers of declamation, aided by an easy delivery and a powerful voice. His rhetoric was of a kind that the people understood, biblical often in phrase and allusion, commanding pathos, and a homely, mordant wit.

He soon came to his own in the House too, where his rhetoric and personal influence became powerful, and his wit was appreciated. Many of his felicitous phrases became current and permanent in parliamentary history. So he said of Lowe and Horsman, when they seceded from Gladstone's side in 1866, that they had 'retired into what may be called their political cave of Adullam.' 'This party of two,' he said, 'is like the Scotch terrier, so covered with hair that you could not tell which was the head and which was the tail.'

Lord Salisbury, never a friend of the Manchester School, yet said of Bright: 'He was the greatest master of English oratory that this generation has seen. At a time when much speaking has almost exterminated eloquence, he maintained that robust, powerful, and vigorous style in which he gave fitting expression to the burning and noble thoughts he desired to utter.'

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE (1809-1898) was born at Liverpool, the son of a wealthy East and West India merchant. He was a notable scholar at Eton and Oxford, and remained a student of the classics and of theology all his life. He entered Parliament already in 1832, as member for Newark, and for some years was on the side of the Tory, High Church Party. He remained a High Churchman until the end, and his theological interests always rivalled his political interests.



and coloured his political views—more than once, in the opinion of his Nonconformist supporters, leading him away from the path of true Liberalism.

The first part of his political life shows a gradual evolution from Toryism to Liberalism. He received office under Peel, already in 1835 having made his mark as a speaker and a young man of promise from the first. He had to give up his seat for Newark on account of his support of Free Trade in 1845, and was elected member for Oxford University in 1847. He became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1852, in the Ministry of Lord Aberdeen, which united the Liberals and the Peelites, the party to which Gladstone belonged, and again in 1859 in the Liberal Ministry of Lord Palmerston. The conflict between Conservative sympathies and Liberal opinions, protracted by the confusion of parties, ended in his definite conversion to Liberalism. Therefore, in 1865, he was defeated at Oxford, was elected as a Liberal for South-west Lancashire and, on the death of Palmerston in the same year, became the leader of the Liberal Party in the Commons. From that time onwards until his death, whether in office or in opposition, the fortunes of the Liberal Party were the fortunes of Gladstone.

He had, from 1859 onwards, made his name as a financier by a series of remarkable budgets. His great Reform Bill of 1866 was defeated, but its chief provisions and its main policy were carried into effect by Disraeli in the following year. Again, in 1884–1885, his further Franchise Bills completed the work of Parliamentary Reform. He achieved the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, and passed the first comprehensive Education Bill and the first Irish Land Act in 1870. His two administrations, from 1868 to 1874 and from 1880 to 1883, were most fruitful in legislation in accordance with the ideals of Liberalism.

The third period in Gladstone's career is marked by the disruption of the powerful party which he led, on the question of Home Rule in Ireland. Gladstone sought, on his return to power in 1886, to find a remedy for the prevailing unrest and agitation in Ireland, and projected a separate Parliament and Executive for Ireland, bringing in a bill to establish them. A number of Liberals seceded, forming the Liberal Unionist Party, which subsequently formed a coalition with the Con-

servatives on every point of policy, and Gladstone was defeated and his party broken. He returned to office in 1892, and again his Home Rule Bill was defeated, this time in the House of Lords, in 1893. He now abandoned the long struggle and retired into private life in 1894, resigning the Premiership to Lord Rosebery.

He died in 1898, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, mourned by the whole nation, the most commanding figure in the political history of the nineteenth century. Never perhaps has a political leader inspired such personal loyalty and affection as did the 'Grand Old Man,' whose name was revered not only in England but throughout Europe.

Great as a political leader and administrator, he was perhaps an even greater orator. Gifted with an impressive presence, a resonant voice, and great physical power, he was a learned and conscious artist in words, combining the genius of Oxford and the worldly wisdom of Liverpool. To this he added an emotional power, a fervour and moral force, that were expressed in dramatic gestures and tones which were none the less effective because they were natural and unaffected. He was a great fighting debater, yet constantly maintained a lofty tone and avoided recrimination. His chief faults were a tendency to over-elaboration and unnecessary rhetoric, and a certain lack of humour. But he had the remarkable power of enforcing attention, and of illuminating even the arid details of a financial statement.

It was therefore with justice that Mr. Balfour said, upon his death, that he added a weight and a dignity to the proceedings of Parliament by his personality and by his oratorical genius.

JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE (1818-1894) was the son of a wealthy clergyman, Archdeacon Froude, a somewhat bigoted Churchman. When he went to Oxford he came under the influence of his brilliant elder brother, Hurrell Froude, and of Newman, leaders of the ritualist Catholic Churchmen, and was indeed destined to become a priest. Later on, however, his opinions changed and he declared his unorthodox views in a book, *The Nemesis of Faith* (1849). Disowned, on account of this book, by his father and friends, he was left to his own resources, and began to make his living by writing. In the same year he met Carlyle, and began that friendship and



discipleship which is one of the most notable in literary history. Like Carlyle, he made his reputation as an historian, and he owed much to Carlyle's inspiration and advice.

Froude contributed to various periodicals, and was editor of *Fraser's Magazine* from 1861 to 1874. His *Short Studies on Great Subjects* are a collection of these contributions. But he is best known by his great historical works dealing with the sixteenth century, of which the chief (1856-1870) is the *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada*. *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century* (published in 1895) is a sidelight upon his favourite period.

His friendship with Carlyle resulted in three notable works, Carlyle's *Reminiscences* and *Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle*, which he edited, and an original *Life of Carlyle*, one of the finest biographies in any language. All of these aroused a most unfortunate controversy, which embittered his life and added to the pain caused by the often baseless and acrimonious attacks of the rival historian, Freeman.

Yet his greatness as an historian and man of letters was fully recognised already in 1868, when the Scottish University of St. Andrews elected him to be Lord Rector; again in 1872, when he was invited to give a series of lectures in America, and accepted the invitation; and in 1892, when he succeeded his literary enemy Freeman as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

Froude was an historian who combined extraordinary industry in research with notable imaginative powers and a vivid and brilliant style. He is, with Macaulay and Gibbon, the most readable and the most artistic of historians. The charge of inaccuracy that has been so often urged against him is mainly based on errors of detail due to carelessness, and occasionally on a preconceived interpretation of history.

He was a politician and an orator rarely and only by accident. As for politics, his butler remarked, 'When the Liberals are in, Mr. Froude is sometimes a Conservative; when the Conservatives are in, Mr. Froude is always a Liberal.' He despised 'government by talking,' and in general despised oratory, and did not understand its practical value. He was sent on a political mission to South Africa in 1874, and again in 1875, and in 1884-1886 toured the Colonies. He always advocated a system of Imperial Federation, with a wisdom

that recent history has shown ; but he refused to engage in party politics or to enter Parliament.

His book on *The English in Ireland* was written from a purely English point of view, and his want of sympathy with the Irish endangered the success of his lectures in America, and even his own life. He was a brilliant lecturer, though not an orator, for he read from manuscript, depending upon the interest, the audacity, and the literary art of his lectures for their success.

He lectured twice before the University of St. Andrews in his capacity as Lord Rector during his three years' term of office, in 1869 upon *Education*, and again in 1871 upon *Calvinism*, and showed in them, not the qualities of a great orator, but of a great teacher, gifted with remarkable learning, literary art, and independence of mind. And even in the decline of his life, when he was over seventy years of age, he delighted and impressed Oxford with such courses of lectures as even that university can rarely have heard. *English Seamen* and *Erasmus* are the printed monuments of two of these courses.

### PART III

## PARLIAMENTARY ETIQUETTE AND PROCEDURE

It is not possible here to give more than a general account of the extremely complicated etiquette and procedure of the British Parliament. This complication is due to the gradual growth throughout the centuries of a mass of traditions and expedients whereby the dignity of the House and the orderly and convenient transaction of its business have been safeguarded and promoted.

The procedure of the House, it is true, has been dealt with by various Ministries from time to time in Standing Orders, which are codes of procedure and must be discussed and passed by the House. But parliamentary etiquette is purely a body of traditions, though the unwritten law is rigidly maintained by the whole House, ever on the watch to cry 'Order,' and to correct the unwary or daring member who commits a breach of etiquette.



Visitors to the House of Commons, who are accommodated in the Strangers' Gallery if in possession of a ticket obtained from a member, are often puzzled by the proceedings, and it is long before even a member learns to avoid the pitfalls that beset him or to master parliamentary tactics. Yet even the minutest detail of procedure or etiquette serves a valuable purpose, and every emergency is provided for, so that the parliamentary machine works smoothly and efficiently.

First, with regard to what we may distinguish as etiquette, a member must address his remarks to the Chair, namely, to the Speaker. He may not, moreover, refer to another member by name, but must refer to him as 'the honourable member for so and so.' He may not refer to the House of Lords, but must speak of it as 'another place.' He may not use language of an insulting nature regarding another member, nor impute dishonourable motives to him. He may not refer to the opinions of the Sovereign, for the Ministers are wholly responsible, and still 'the King can do no wrong.' He may not challenge the ruling of the Speaker, whose authority is paramount, and who may suspend a disorderly member from the service of the House.

By these rules the dignity of debate is maintained, the courteous and seemly relations between member and members, member and Sovereign, and House and House, are preserved, and a tone of impersonal reasonableness fostered, even amid the storms of party strife.

It is to be noted that these rules do not hold in the House of Lords, the members of which address their peers, refer to each other by name, and themselves maintain the order of the House.

The procedure of the House of Commons is roughly as follows: The House meets at three o'clock, and proceedings open with prayer, offered by the Chaplain. In order to secure and reserve a seat for the day, any ordinary member must be present at prayers. The business to be transacted is laid down in the Orders of the Day, which are printed and distributed. The Government has a certain proportion of the time allotted to its business, when it may bring forward its official bills. Private bills and motions must take their chance in a ballot in order to find a place on the Orders.

Due notice must be given of the introduction of a bill, and

on the day appointed the bill is introduced and 'read' a first time. The bill is then printed and a day fixed for the second reading. It is hardly ever opposed on the first reading, but is thoroughly debated on the second reading. If it is then passed, the House has declared that the principle of the bill is acceptable. It is then discussed in detail, clause by clause, in Committee.

*Committee* is a committee of the whole House, with differences of procedure. The Chairman of Committees (who is also Deputy Speaker) presides, the Speaker having left the chair, and the mace, the symbol of the sovereignty of Parliament, having been removed from the table. In the *House* a member may speak only once on any one question, but in *Committee* this restriction is withdrawn and the discussion is essentially of a practical and businesslike nature. The bill is here improved by amendment and fashioned into a useful and practical piece of legislation, often by a small number of experts. If the bill is passed here, Committee reports it to the House, where a further debate takes place. No bill can be rejected in Committee, though its promoters may withdraw it if it is so radically amended as to change its whole nature.

The Third Reading is then ordered, when a final debate takes place. If the bill still survives, it is then sent up to the House of Lords, where the entire series of ordeals is repeated, after which, if passed, it is put before the Sovereign. When it receives the Royal Assent, it becomes law. Any bill, except financial bills, may equally originate in the House of Lords. In this case, it is first dealt with by the Lords, and then sent to the Commons.

It is obvious that at any of these numerous stages the bill may fall, and no bill may be introduced twice in the same session. All resolutions and bills are presented to the House by the Speaker in the form of a question, to which the House shall answer Aye or No. The commonest method of moving the rejection of a bill is to move an amendment to the *question*, 'That this bill be now read a second time,' for example, in the following form, 'That this bill be read a second time this day six months.' As Parliament will by then be dissolved, the bill is disposed of for that session. The 'previous question,' or direct negative of the question, is of rare occurrence.



The Speaker first puts the original question before the House, requesting those in favour to say Aye, and those who oppose it to say No. Judging by the relative strength of the two successive shouts that follow he declares that 'the Ayes have it,' or 'the Noes have it.' His decision may be challenged by even a single member, and he then proceeds to a division. Tellers are appointed to count the votes, two on each side, and the division bell is rung throughout the House. After two minutes, measured by the Speaker by a sand-glass, he rises and calls 'Order! Order!' and the doors are closed. He then directs the Ayes to the division lobby on the right and the Noes to that on the left. Leaving the lobbies by a different door, the members are counted and noted as they emerge, by clerks. The tellers report to the Speaker, who announces the result to the House.

Should the original question be rejected, the Speaker then proceeds to put the amendment before the House in the same manner.

A bill may also be got rid of by devious means. It may, under certain conditions, be 'talked out' by a member who continues to speak until the hour fixed for the suspension of business. It may also be 'counted out,' if a member is able to call the attention of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committee to the fact that less than forty members are present in the House.

It will thus be seen that any bill which becomes law has been subjected to a most rigorous scrutiny, in its general aspects in the House, and in its details as a practical piece of legislation, in Committee. The conditions under which it has undergone this scrutiny and this discussion ensure an atmosphere of courtesy, dignity, and reasonableness as far as it is possible when such vast interests are at stake. And the high traditions and prestige of the Mother of Parliaments after many centuries remain unimpaired among the nations.

# I

## THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY LITERARY COPYRIGHT

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEBRUARY 5, 1841

[On Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Copyright Bill.]

Y. THOUGH, sir, it is in some sense agreeable to approach a subject with which political animosities have nothing to do, I offer myself to your notice with some reluctance. It is painful to me to take a course which may possibly be misunderstood or misrepresented as unfriendly to the interests 5 of literature and literary men. It is painful to me, I will add, to oppose my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Serjeant Talfourd) on a question which he has taken up from the purest motives, and which he regards with a parental interest. These feelings have hitherto kept me silent when the law of copy- 10 right has been under discussion. But as I am, on full consideration, satisfied that the measure before us will, if adopted, inflict grievous injury on the public, without conferring any compensating advantage on men of letters, I think it my duty to avow that opinion and to defend it. 15

The first thing to be done, sir, is to settle on what principles the question is to be argued. Are we free to legislate for the public good, or are we not? Is this a question of expediency, or is it a question of right? Many of those who have written and petitioned against the existing state of 20 things, treat the question as one of right. The law of nature, according to them, gives to every man a sacred and inde-<sup>u</sup>-feasible property in his own ideas, in the fruits of his own<sup>n-l</sup> reason and imagination. The legislature has indeed the power<sup>ole</sup>



to take away this property, just as it has the power to pass an act of attainder for cutting off an innocent man's head without a trial. But as such an act of attainder would be legal murder, so would an act invading the right of an author to his copy  
5 be, according to these gentlemen, legal robbery.

Now, sir, if this be so, let justice be done, cost what it may. I am not prepared, like my hon. and learned friend, to agree to a compromise between right and expediency, to commit an injustice for the public convenience. But I must say,  
10 that his theory soars far beyond the reach of my faculties. It is not necessary to go, on the present occasion, into a metaphysical inquiry about the origin of the right of property ; and certainly nothing but the strongest necessity would lead me to discuss a subject so likely to be distasteful to the House.  
15 I agree, I own, with Paley in thinking that property is the creature of the law, and that the law which creates property can be defended only on this ground, that it is a law beneficial to mankind. But it is unnecessary to debate that point. For even if I believed in a natural right of property, inde-  
20 pendent of utility and anterior to legislation, I should still deny that this right could survive the original proprietor.

Few, I apprehend, even of those who have studied in the most mystical and sentimental schools of moral philosophy, will be disposed to maintain that there is a natural law of  
25 succession older and of higher authority than any human code. If there be, it is quite certain that we have abuses to reform much more serious than any connected with the question of copyright. For this natural law can be only one, and the modes of succession in the Queen's dominions are twenty.  
30 To go no further than England, land generally descends to the eldest son. In Kent the sons share and share alike ; in many districts the youngest takes the whole. Formerly a portion of a man's personal property was secured to his family. It was only of the residue that he could dispose by will. Now  
35 he can dispose of the whole by will. But a few years ago you enacted, that the will should not be valid unless there were two witnesses. If a man dies intestate, his personal property generally goes according to the statute of distributions. But there are local customs which modify that statute.  
40 Now which of all these systems is conformed to the eternal standard of right ? Is it primogeniture, or gavelkind, or



borough English? Are wills *jure divino*? Are the two witnesses *jure divino*? Might not the *pars rationabilis* of our old law have as fair a claim to be regarded as of celestial institution? Was the statute of distributions enacted in Heaven long before it was adopted by Parliament? Or is it to Custom of York, or to Custom of London, that this pre-eminence belongs?

Surely, sir, even those who hold that there is a natural right of property must admit that rules prescribing the manner in which the effects of deceased persons shall be distributed are purely arbitrary, and originate altogether in the will of the legislature. If so, sir, there is no controversy between my hon. and learned friend and myself as to the principles on which this question is to be argued. For the existing law gives an author copyright during his natural life; nor do I propose to invade that privilege, which I should, on the contrary, be prepared to defend strenuously against any assailant. The point in issue is, how long after an author's death the State shall recognise a copyright in his representatives and assigns, and it can, I think, hardly be disputed by any rational man that this is a point which the legislature is free to determine in the way which may appear to be most conducive to the general good.

We may now, therefore, I think, descend from these high regions, where we are in danger of being lost in the clouds, to firm ground and clear light. Let us look at this question like legislators, and after fairly balancing conveniences and inconveniences, pronounce between the existing law of copyright and the law now proposed to us.

The question of copyright, sir, like most questions of civil prudence, is neither black nor white, but grey. The system of copyright has great advantages and great disadvantages, and it is our business to ascertain what these are, and then to make an arrangement under which the advantages may be as far as possible secured, and the disadvantages as far as possible excluded. The charge which I bring against my hon. and learned friend's bill is this, that it leaves the advantages nearly what they are at present and increases the disadvantages at least fourfold.

The advantages arising from a system of copyright are obvious. It is desirable that we should have a supply of good



books ; we cannot have such a supply unless men of letters are liberally remunerated, and the least objectionable way of remunerating them is by means of copyright. You cannot depend for literary instruction and amusement on the leisure  
5 of men occupied in the pursuits of active life. Such men may occasionally produce pieces of great merit. But you must not look to them for works which require deep meditation and long research. Such works you can expect only from persons who make literature the business of their lives. Of these  
10 persons few will be found among the rich and the noble. The rich and the noble are not impelled to intellectual exertion by necessity. They may be impelled to intellectual exertion by the desire of distinguishing themselves, or by the desire of benefiting the community. But it is generally within  
15 these walls that they seek to signalise themselves and to serve their fellow-creatures. Both their ambition and their public spirit, in a country like this, naturally take a political turn. It is then on men whose profession is literature, and whose private means are not ample, that you must rely for a supply  
20 of valuable books. Such men must be remunerated for their literary labour. And there are only two ways in which they can be remunerated. One of those ways is patronage ; the other is copyright.

There have been times in which men of letters looked, not  
25 to the public, but to the Government, or to a few great men, for the reward of their exertions. It was thus in the time of Maecenas and Pollio at Rome, of the Medici at Florence, of Louis the Fourteenth in France, of Lord Halifax and Lord Oxford in this country. Now, sir, I well know that there are  
30 cases in which it is fit and graceful, nay, in which it is a sacred duty, to reward the merits or to relieve the distresses of men of genius by the exercise of this species of liberality. But these cases are exceptions. I can conceive no system more fatal to the integrity and independence of literary men, than one  
35 under which they should be taught to look for their daily bread to the favour of ministers and nobles. I can conceive no system more certain to turn those minds which are formed by nature to be the blessings and ornaments of our species into its scandal and its pest.

40 We have, then, only one resource left. We must betake ourselves to copyright, be the inconveniences of copyright



what they may. Those inconveniences, in truth, are neither few nor small. Copyright is monopoly, and produces all the effects which the general voice of mankind attributes to monopoly. My hon. and learned friend talks very contemptuously of those who are led away by the theory that monopoly makes things dear. That monopoly makes things dear is certainly a theory, as all the great truths which have been established by the experience of all ages and nations, and which are taken for granted in all reasonings, may be said to be theories. It is a theory in the same sense in which it is a theory that day and night follow each other, that lead is heavier than water, that bread nourishes, that arsenic poisons, that alcohol intoxicates. If, as my hon. and learned friend seems to hold, the whole world is in the wrong on this point, if the real effect of monopoly is to make articles good and cheap, why does he stop short in his career of change? Why does he limit the operation of so salutary a principle to sixty years? Why does he consent to anything short of a perpetuity? He told us that, in consenting to anything short of a perpetuity, he was making a compromise between extreme right and expediency. But, if his opinion about monopoly be correct, extreme right and expediency would coincide. Or rather, why should we not restore the monopoly of the East India trade to the East India Company? Why should we not revive all those old monopolies which, in Elizabeth's reign, galled our fathers so severely that, maddened by intolerable wrong, they opposed to their sovereign a resistance before which her haughty spirit quailed for the first and for the last time? Was it the cheapness and excellence of commodities that then so violently stirred the indignation of the English people? I believe, sir, that I may safely take it for granted that the effect of monopoly generally is to make articles scarce, to make them dear, and to make them bad. And I may with equal safety challenge my hon. friend to find out any distinction between copyright and other privileges of the same kind,—any reason why a monopoly of books should produce an effect directly the reverse of that which was produced by the East India Company's monopoly of tea, or by Lord Essex's monopoly of sweet wines.

Thus, then, stands the case. It is good, that authors should be remunerated; and the least exceptionable way of



remunerating them is by a monopoly. Yet monopoly is an evil. For the sake of the good we must submit to the evil; but the evil ought not to last a day longer than is necessary for the purpose of securing the good.

5 Now, I will not affirm that the existing law is perfect, that it exactly hits the point at which the monopoly ought to cease; but this I confidently say, that it is very much nearer that point than the law proposed by my hon. and learned friend. For consider this: the evil effects of the monopoly are pro-  
 10 portioned to the length of its duration. But the good effects for the sake of which we bear with the evil effects are by no means proportioned to the length of its duration. A monopoly of 60 years produces twice as much evil as a monopoly of 30 years, and thrice as much evil as a monopoly of 20 years.  
 15 But it is by no means the fact that a posthumous monopoly of 60 years gives to an author thrice as much pleasure, and thrice as strong a motive as a posthumous monopoly of 20 years. On the contrary, the difference is so small as to be hardly perceptible. We all know how faintly we are affected  
 20 by the prospect of very distant advantages, even when they are advantages which we may reasonably hope that we shall ourselves enjoy. But an advantage that is to be enjoyed more than half a century after we are dead, by somebody, we know not whom, perhaps by somebody unborn, by somebody  
 25 utterly unconnected with us, is really no motive to action. It is very probable that, in the course of some generations, land in the unexplored and unmapped heart of the Australian continent will be very valuable. But there is none of us who would lay down five pounds for a whole province in the  
 30 heart of the Australian continent. We know that neither we, nor anybody for whom we care, will ever receive a farthing of rent from such a province. And a man is very little moved by the thought that in the year 2000 or 2100 somebody who claims through him will employ more shepherds than Prince  
 35 Esterhazy, and will have the finest house and gallery of pictures at Victoria or Sydney.

Now, this is the sort of boon which my hon. and learned friend holds out to authors. Considered as a boon to them, it is a mere nullity; but, considered as an impost on the public  
 40 it is no nullity, but a very serious and pernicious reality. I will take an example. Dr. Johnson died fifty-six years ago.



If the law were what my hon. and learned friend wishes to make it, somebody would now have the monopoly of Dr. Johnson's works. Who that somebody would be, it is impossible to say ; but we may venture to guess. I guess, then, that it would have been some bookseller, who was the assign 5 of another bookseller, who was the grandson of a third bookseller, who had bought the copyright from Black Frank, the doctor's servant, in 1785 or 1786. Now, would the knowledge that this copyright would exist in 1841 have been a source of gratification to Johnson ? Would it have stimulated his 10 exertions ? Would it have once drawn him out of his bed before noon ? Would it have once cheered him under a fit of the spleen ? Would it have induced him to give us one more allegory, one more life of a poet, one more imitation of Juvenal ? I firmly believe not. I firmly believe that a 15 hundred years ago, when he was writing our debates for the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he would very much rather have had twopence to buy a plate of shin of beef at a cook's shop underground. Considered as a reward to him, the difference between a twenty years' term and a sixty years' term of posthumous 20 copyright would have been nothing, or next to nothing. But is the difference nothing to us ? I can buy *Rasselas* for sixpence ; I might have had to give five shillings for it. I can buy the Dictionary—the entire genuine Dictionary—for two guineas, perhaps for less ; I might have had to give five 25 or six guineas for it. Do I grudge this to a man like Dr. Johnson ? Not at all. Show me that the prospect of this boon roused him to any vigorous effort, or sustained his spirits under depressing circumstances, and I am quite willing to pay the price of such an object, heavy as that price is. 30 But what I do complain of is that my circumstances are to be worse, and Johnson's none the better ; that I am to give five pounds for what to him was not worth a farthing.

The principle of copyright is this. It is a tax on readers for the purpose of giving a bounty to writers. The tax is 35 an exceedingly bad one ; it is a tax on one of the most innocent and most salutary of human pleasures ; and never let us forget that a tax on innocent pleasures is a premium on vicious pleasures. I admit, however, the necessity of giving a bounty to genius and learning. In order to give such a bounty, I 40 willingly submit even to this severe and burdensome tax.



Nay, I am ready to increase the tax, if it can be shown that by so doing I should proportionably increase the bounty. My complaint is, that my hon. and learned friend doubles, triples, quadruples the tax, and makes scarcely any perceptible addition to the bounty. To recur to the case of Dr. Johnson,—what is the additional amount of taxation which would have been levied on the public for Dr. Johnson's works alone, if my hon. and learned friend's bill had been the law of the land? I have not data sufficient to form an opinion. But I am confident that the taxation on his Dictionary alone would have amounted to many thousands of pounds. In reckoning the whole additional sum which the holders of his copyrights would have taken out of the pockets of the public during the last half-century at twenty thousand pounds, I feel satisfied that I very greatly underrate it. Now, I again say, that I think it but fair that we should pay twenty thousand pounds in consideration of twenty thousand pounds' worth of pleasure and encouragement received by Dr. Johnson. But I think it very hard that we should pay twenty thousand pounds for what he would not have valued at five shillings.

My hon. and learned friend dwells on the claims of the posterity of great writers. Undoubtedly, sir, it would be very pleasing to see a descendant of Shakespeare living in opulence on the fruits of his great ancestor's genius. A house maintained in splendour by such a patrimony would be a more interesting and striking object than Blenheim is to us, or than Strathfieldsaye will be to our children. But, unhappily, it is scarcely possible that, under any system, such a thing can come to pass. My hon. and learned friend does not propose that copyright shall descend to the eldest son, or shall be bound up by irrevocable entail. It is to be merely personal property. It is, therefore, highly improbable that it will descend during sixty years or half that term from parent to child. The chance is that more people than one will have an interest in it. They will in all probability sell it and divide the proceeds. The price which a bookseller will give for it will bear no proportion to the sum which he will afterwards draw from the public, if his speculation proves successful. He will give little, if anything, more for a term of sixty years than for a term of thirty or five-and-twenty. The present value of a distant advantage is always small; but when there



is great room to doubt whether a distant advantage will be any advantage at all, the present value sinks to almost nothing.

Such is the inconstancy of the public taste, that no sensible man will venture to pronounce, with confidence, what the sale of any book published in our days will be in the years 5 between 1890 and 1900. The whole fashion of thinking and writing has often undergone a change in a much shorter period than that to which my hon. and learned friend would extend posthumous copyright. What would have been considered the best literary property in the earlier part of 10 Charles the Second's reign? I imagine, Cowley's Poems. Overleap sixty years, and you are in the generation of which Pope asked, 'Who now reads Cowley?' What works were ever expected with more impatience by the public than those of Lord Bolingbroke, which appeared, I think, in 1754? In 15 1814, no bookseller would have thanked you for the copyright of them all, if you had offered it to him for nothing. What would Paternoster Row give now for the copyright of Hayley's *Triumphs of Temper*, so much admired within the memory of many people still living? I say, therefore, that, from the 20 very nature of literary property, it will almost always pass away from an author's family; and I say that the price given for it to the family will bear a very small proportion to the tax which the purchaser, if his speculation turns out well, will in the course of a long series of years levy on the 25 public.

If, sir, I wished to find a strong and perfect illustration of the effects which I anticipate from long copyright, I should select,—my hon. and learned friend will be surprised,—I should select the case of Milton's granddaughter. As often 30 as this bill has been under discussion, the fate of Milton's granddaughter has been brought forward by the advocates of monopoly. My hon. and learned friend has repeatedly told the story with great eloquence and effect. He has dilated on the sufferings, on the abject poverty, of this ill- 35 fated woman, the last of an illustrious race. He tells us that, in the extremity of her distress, Garrick gave her a benefit, that Johnson wrote a prologue, and that the public contributed some hundreds of pounds. Was it fit, he asks, that she should receive, in this eleemosynary form, a small portion of 40 what was in truth a debt? Why, he asks, instead of obtaining



a pittance from charity, did she not live in comfort and luxury on the proceeds of the sale of her ancestor's works? But, sir, will my hon. and learned friend tell me that this event, which he has so often and so pathetically described, 5 was caused by the shortness of copyright? Why, at that time, the duration of copyright was longer than even he, at present, proposes to make it. The monopoly lasted not sixty years, but for ever. At the time at which Milton's granddaughter asked charity, Milton's works were the exclusive 10 property of a bookseller. Within a few months of the day on which the benefit was given at Garrick's theatre, the holder of the copyright of *Paradise Lost*—I think it was Tonson—applied to the Court of Equity for an injunction against a bookseller, who had published a cheap edition of the great 15 epic poem, and obtained his injunction. The representation of *Comus* was, if I remember rightly, in 1750; the injunction in 1752.

Here, then, is a perfect illustration of what I conceive to be the effect of long copyright. Milton's works are the pro- 20 perty of a single publisher. Everybody, who wants them, must buy them at Tonson's shop, and at Tonson's price. Whoever attempts to undersell Tonson is harassed with legal proceedings. Thousands who would gladly possess a copy of *Paradise Lost* must forgo that great enjoyment. And 25 what, in the meantime, is the situation of the only person for whom we can suppose that the author, protected at such a cost to the public, was at all interested? She is reduced to utter destitution. Milton's works are under a monopoly; Milton's granddaughter is starving. The reader is pillaged; 30 but the writer's family is not enriched. Society is taxed doubly. It has to give an exorbitant price for the poems; and it has at the same time to give alms to the only surviving descendant of the poet.

But this is not all. I think it right, sir, to call the attention 35 of the House to an evil, which is perhaps more to be apprehended when an author's copyright remains in the hands of his family than when it is transferred to booksellers. I seriously fear that if such a measure as this should be adopted, many valuable works will be either totally suppressed or 40 grievously mutilated. I can prove that this danger is not chimerical; and I am quite certain that, if the danger be

real, the safeguards which my hon. and learned friend has devised are altogether nugatory. That the danger is not chimerical may easily be shown. Most of us, I am sure, have known persons who, very erroneously, as I think, but from the best motives, would not choose to reprint Fielding's novels, 5 or Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Some gentlemen may perhaps be of opinion that it would be as well if *Tom Jones* and Gibbon's *History* were never reprinted. I will not, then, dwell on these or similar cases. I will take cases respecting which it is not likely that 10 there will be any difference of opinion here; cases, too, in which the danger of which I now speak is not matter of supposition, but matter of fact. Take Richardson's novels. Whatever I may, on the present occasion, think of my hon. and learned friend's judgement as a legislator, I must always respect his 15 judgement as a critic. He will, I am sure, say that Richardson's novels are among the most valuable, among the most original works in our language. No writings have done more to raise the fame of English genius in foreign countries. No writings are more deeply pathetic. No writings, those of 20 Shakespeare excepted, show such profound knowledge of the human heart. As to their moral tendency, I can cite the most respectable testimony. Dr. Johnson describes Richardson as one who had taught the passions to move at the command of virtue. My dear and honoured friend, Mr. Wilberforce, 25 in his celebrated religious treatise, when speaking of the unchristian tendency of the fashionable novels of the eighteenth century, most distinctly excepts Richardson from the censure. Another excellent person whom I can never mention without respect and kindness, Mrs. Hannah More, often 30 declared in conversation, and has declared in one of her published poems, that she first learned from the writings of Richardson those principles of piety by which her life was guided. I may safely say, that books celebrated as works of art through the whole civilised world, and praised for their 35 moral tendency by Dr. Johnson, by Mr. Wilberforce, by Mrs. Hannah More, ought not to be suppressed. Sir, it is my firm belief, that if the law had been what my hon. and learned friend proposes to make it, they would have been suppressed. I remember Richardson's grandson well; he was a clergyman 40 in the city of London; he was a most upright and excellent



man ; but he had conceived a strong prejudice against works of fiction. He thought all novel-reading not only frivolous but sinful. He said,—this I state on the authority of one of his clerical brethren, who is now a bishop—he said that he  
 5 had never thought it right to read one of his grandfather's books. Suppose, sir, that the law had been what my hon. and learned friend would make it. Suppose that the copyright of Richardson's novels had descended, as might well have been the case, to this gentleman. I firmly believe that  
 10 he would have thought it sinful to give them wide circulation. I firmly believe that he would not for a hundred thousand pounds have deliberately done what he thought sinful. He would not have reprinted them. And what protection does my hon. and learned friend give to the public in such a case ?  
 15 Why, sir, what he proposes is this : if a book is not reprinted during five years, any person who wishes to reprint it may give notice in the *London Gazette* : the advertisement must be repeated three times ; a year must elapse ; and then, if the proprietor of the copyright does not put forth a new edition,  
 20 he loses his exclusive privilege. Now, what protection is this to the public ? What is a new edition ? Does the law define the number of copies that make an edition ? Does it limit the price of a copy ? Are twelve copies on large paper, charged at thirty guineas each, an edition ? It has been  
 25 usual, when monopolies have been granted, to prescribe numbers and to limit prices. But I do not find that my hon. and learned friend proposes to do so in the present case. And, without some such provision, the security which he offers is manifestly illusory. It is my conviction that, under  
 30 such a system as that which he recommends to us, a copy of *Clarissa* would have been as rare as an Aldus or a Caxton.

I will give another instance. One of the most instructive, interesting, and delightful books in our language is Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. Now it is well known that Boswell's eldest  
 35 son considered this book, considered the whole relation of Boswell to Johnson, as a blot in the escutcheon of the family. He thought, not perhaps altogether without reason, that his father had exhibited himself in a ludicrous and degrading light. And thus he became so sore and irritable that at  
 40 last he could not bear to hear the *Life of Johnson* mentioned. Suppose that the law had been what my hon. and learned



friend wishes to make it. Suppose that the copyright of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* had belonged, as it well might, during sixty years to Boswell's eldest son. What would have been the consequence? An unadulterated copy of the finest biographical work in the world would have been as scarce 5 as the first edition of Camden.

These are strong cases. I have shown you that, if the law had been what you are now going to make it, the finest prose work of fiction in the language, the finest biographical work in the language, would very probably have been suppressed. 10 But I have stated my case weakly. The books which I have mentioned are singularly inoffensive books, books not touching on any of those questions which drive even wise men beyond the bounds of wisdom. There are books of a very different kind, books which are the rallying-points of great 15 political and religious parties. What is likely to happen if the copyright of one of these books should by descent or transfer come into the possession of some hostile zealot? I will take a single instance. It is fifty years since John Wesley died; his works, if the law had been what my hon. 20 and learned friend seeks to make it, would now have been the property of some person or other. The sect founded by Wesley is the most numerous, the wealthiest, the most powerful, the most zealous, of sects. In every election it is a matter of the greatest importance to obtain the support of the Wesleyan 25 Methodists. Their numerical strength is reckoned by hundreds of thousands. They hold the memory of their founder in the greatest reverence; and not without reason, for he was unquestionably a great and a good man. To his authority they constantly appeal. His works are in their 30 eyes of the highest value. His doctrinal writings they regard as containing the best system of theology ever deduced from Scripture. His journals, interesting even to the common reader, are peculiarly interesting to the Methodist: for they contain the whole history of that singular polity which, weak 35 and despised in its beginning, is now, after the lapse of a century, so strong, so flourishing, and so formidable. The hymns to which he gave his *imprimatur* are a most important part of the public worship of his followers. Now, suppose that the copyright of these works belonged to some person who holds 40 the memory of Wesley and the doctrines and discipline of



the Methodists in abhorrence. There are many such persons. The Ecclesiastical Courts are at this very time sitting on the case of a clergyman of the Established Church who refused Christian burial to a child baptized by a Methodist preacher.

5 I took up the other day a work which is considered as among the most respectable organs of a large and growing party in the Church of England and there I saw John Wesley designated as a forsworn priest. Suppose that the works of Wesley were suppressed. Why, sir, such a grievance would be enough

10 to shake the foundation of Government. Let gentlemen who are attached to the Church reflect for a moment what their feelings would be if the Book of Common Prayer were not to be reprinted for thirty or forty years,—if the price of a Book of Common Prayer were run up to five or ten guineas.

15 And then let them determine whether they will pass a law under which it is possible, under which it is probable, that so intolerable a wrong may be done to some sect consisting perhaps of half a million of persons.

I am so sensible, sir, of the kindness with which the House

20 has listened to me, that I will not detain you longer. I will only say this, that if the measure before us should pass, and should produce one-tenth part of the evil which it is calculated to produce, and which I fully expect it to produce, there will soon be a remedy, though of a very objectionable kind. Just

25 as the absurd Acts which prohibited the sale of game were virtually repealed by the poacher, just as many absurd revenue acts have been virtually repealed by the smuggler, will this law be virtually repealed by piratical booksellers. At present the holder of copyright has the public feeling on his side.

30 Those who invade copyright are regarded as knaves who take the bread out of the mouths of deserving men. Everybody is well pleased to see them restrained by the law and compelled to refund their ill-gotten gains. No tradesman of good repute will have anything to do with such disgraceful

35 transactions. Pass this law, and that feeling is at an end. Men of a character very different from that of the present race of piratical booksellers will soon infringe this intolerable monopoly. Great masses of capital will be constantly employed in the violation of the law. Every art will be employed

40 to evade legal pursuit; and the whole nation will be in the plot. On which side indeed should the public sympathy be

when the question is whether some book as popular as *Robinson Crusoe* or the *Pilgrim's Progress* shall be in every cottage, or whether it shall be confined to the libraries of the rich for the advantage of the great-grandson of a bookseller who, a hundred years before, drove a hard bargain for the copyright 5 with the author when in great distress? Remember too that, when once it ceases to be considered as wrong and discreditable to invade literary property, no person can say where the invasion will stop. The public seldom makes nice distinctions. The wholesome copyright which now exists 10 will share in the disgrace and danger of the new copyright which you are about to create. And you will find that, in attempting to impose unreasonable restraints on the reprinting of the works of the dead, you have, to a great extent, annulled those restraints which now prevent men from pillaging 15 and defrauding the living. If I saw, sir, any probability that this bill could be so amended in the committee that my objections might be removed, I would not divide the House in this stage. But I am so fully convinced that no alteration which would not seem insupportable to my hon. and learned 20 friend, could render his measure supportable to me, that I must move, though with regret, that this bill be read a second time this day six months.



## II

### BENJAMIN DISRAELI

#### NATIONAL REPRESENTATION

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 20, 1848

[On Mr. HUME's Motion, 'That this House, as at present constituted, does not fairly represent the population, the property, or the industry of the country, whence has arisen great and increasing discontent in the minds of a large portion of the people; and it is therefore expedient, with a view to amend the national representation, that the elective franchise shall be so extended as to include all householders; that votes shall be taken by ballot; that the duration of Parliaments shall not exceed three years, and that the apportionment of Members to population shall be made more equal.']

10 MR. HENRY DRUMMOND and LORD JOHN RUSSELL spoke against, and Mr. W. J. FOX in favour of the Motion.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, the best answer to the animated address of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Fox) is the resolution of the Member for Montrose. The hon. Gentleman has avowed  
15 himself to-night the advocate of those whom he describes as serfs. But I cannot find in the resolution of the hon. Member for Montrose that he is prepared to enfranchise those serfs. The speech of the hon. Gentleman refers to a class of men the circumstances of whose lives, as he describes them, are,  
20 in my opinion, extremely imaginary. But whether they are real, or whether they are imaginary, no one can suppose for a moment that the project of the hon. Member for Montrose is one that at all provides the means of alleviating or of elevating their condition in the social or political scale. What-  
25 ever may be the prejudices of the hon. Gentleman against the £10 elector, the proposition of the hon. Member for Montrose is not one that will enfranchise poets sleeping under hedges.

That is not the proposition of the hon. Gentleman. And however comprehensive may be the sympathies of the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Fox), I cannot understand how, entertaining those opinions, and animated by those feelings, he can find it his duty to take so prominent a part in this 5 debate—I mean as to the moment he has risen in it: how, with those opinions, he can avow himself the friend of a project which would seem rather to increase the difficulties of those classes whose interests he advocates, by raising up barriers to their hopes, and which marks them out as un- 10 worthy of the new privileges which are to be accorded. With respect to the proposition itself, or similar ones, the Gentlemen who sit upon this side of the House are in a very different position from that of the hon. Gentleman and his supporters, or the Members of Her Majesty's Government. It is not for 15 us, sir, either to defend or attack the Reform Act. We obey it. When it was first brought forward it encountered the criticism of those who were opposed to His Majesty's Ministers in 1832. Perhaps it benefited in some degree by that opposition. But when it had passed—when it became the law of 20 the country—it received from us that allegiance which the law in this country always commands; and no doubt the remedial and practical sense of this country has prevented some of those evils which were then anticipated.

But, sir, when I say that we neither defend nor attack the 25 Reform Act I cannot myself believe that in an age like the present, when a Motion like that of the hon. Member for Montrose is brought forward, it is consistent with our duty—with the position we occupy with regard to our constituents and the country—and as the representatives of the party 30 who originally were the opponents of the change of 1832—I do not think it is consistent with our duty that we should evade the difficulties of this debate; and some there are who think it is one not unfruitful of difficulty. Therefore I wish to take this opportunity, if the House will allow me, and at 35 this hour, with as much brevity as I can command, to make some observations on the project which has been brought forward with so much preparation—which has been so sedulously prepared, but the true character of which I believe is not yet accurately appreciated, and which cer- 40 tainly seems not to be understood by the eloquent advocate



we have just heard, who is prepared to enfranchise imaginary serfs and popular poets. Now, sir, the hon. Gentleman towards the close of his address told us that he was the advocate of fiscal reform. The hon. Gentleman who introduced this project dwelt but slightly on that topic. Yet I have watched with attention, and read with an observation of no careless character, the proceedings that have been conducted by the hon. Gentleman and by his friends at the meetings they have called, and the resolutions they have offered for the consideration of those assembled ; and I have always found that, on every occasion, financial and fiscal reform has been most sedulously brought forward, and that the principal plea for parliamentary reconstruction and political revolution has always been the increase in the expenditure and taxation of the country under the system that exists ; and I had occasion this afternoon to listen to a great number of petitions that were presented, and I found the same tone pervade the whole of them. The same echo had been caught by all : they all assumed the increased expenditure of the Government, and the enormous amount of taxation of the country ; and these were the causes—these the pleas—at the popular meetings, in the popular resolutions, and the popular speeches, of the hon. Gentleman and the new party, that were brought forward as the basis and principal reason for political changes. I want to know what is the reason that to-night we have heard so little of fiscal and financial reform.

Now, sir, I can easily understand why the hon. Gentleman who has just addressed the House did not dwell on that subject. The hon. Gentleman is a master of statistics, but of statistics of a different kind from those we are accustomed to in this House—very important, very interesting, no doubt—the amount of penny publications, the great increase in cheap literature, the development of railway intellect, and of all those productions you may find at the terminus or the station—circumstances in the age highly deserving of consideration, and which would not escape the observation of any sensible man. Still, these are not the statistics that touch the question of fiscal and financial reform, of which we have heard so much, and which are the real pleas, and were the popular pleas, of this movement and this new party, and which I wish to see clearly placed before the House, and



before those measures for which they were the pleas are brought under our consideration. Now, sir, I reserve to myself—with the permission of the House, and with as much brevity as I can command—I reserve to myself the right of giving my opinion upon these measures, whatever I may think of the fallacy or truth of those pleas. But I think the House will agree with me that, after all England has for months been told that there has been in this country an enormous increase of taxation, and an enormous increase in the expenditure of the Government—told this, too, at a period of general suffering and general disturbance—told to the people of this country in order to impress upon them that there ought, as there had been changes in other countries, to be a change here, in consequence of our oppressive taxation and the injurious expenditure of our Government—it is of some importance that, in a debate like the present, this House and the country should clearly understand whether those pleas are true or not. I give the hon. Member for Montrose and his friends the benefit of this full admission, that whether those pleas be true or not—however those circumstances may affect the position of himself and his friends in this controversy—they are circumstances which do not affect the abstract excellence or necessity of his measures.

Now, sir, one word, then, as to the enormous increase of taxation in this country, which is the principal reason for a change in our parliamentary constitution. I shall not at midnight refer, except by memory, to any documents; but the facts to which I refer are so well authenticated that I speak in the presence of many who, in a moment, can confute me if I make any great mistake. I take the period of twenty years ago—a little prior to the passing of the Reform Bill. The revenue that was raised in this country, in 1828, from our ordinary sources, was forty-nine and a half millions in round numbers. The same revenue raised in 1848—that is, twenty years afterwards—was forty-seven and a half millions. How is it possible, then, that the hon. Gentleman can maintain the position that taxation in this country has oppressively increased? But the revenue of 1828 was not only two millions greater from our ordinary sources—of course I omit the Income-tax, which does not touch the working classes—the revenue raised in 1848, but the revenue in 1828 was raised



from a population, in round numbers, of less than twenty-three millions, while the same revenue in 1848 was raised from a population of thirty millions. Why, sir, if you only calculate per head the burden of taxation of these two periods, 5 you will find, I think, that in 1828 the people of England were taxed something like £2 3s. 2d. a head ; and, in 1848, £1 12s. 2d. These figures measure the difference of the proportion borne by the annual taxation imposed by the State to the general fund out of which it is paid ; and this on the assumption that 10 the annual wealth of the country has increased in a ratio equal to the population. But we all know—and no man can be ignorant of it, for the documents are upstairs—that the annual wealth of the country has increased in a greater ratio than the population. Well then, sir, what becomes of the 15 plea for political change founded on an oppressive increase of taxation under the existing system ? But it is not only true that taxation per head in this country in 1848, as compared with twenty years ago, has been considerably reduced in amount, but there is another circumstance of deep importance which ought never to be forgotten—that there has been 20 a great redistribution of taxation—that the amount raised has been redistributed—and in every instance the alteration has been effected in favour of the working classes of this country. Sir, I have a return here, but I think I can trust 25 my memory as to its results. The Customs for the years 1827 and 1847—which two years were the financial years of 1828 and 1848—the Customs of 1827 amounted to £18,000,000, and they barely exceeded £18,000,000 in 1847. The Excise was £18,500,000 in 1827, and it was less than £12,000,000 in 30 1847. The Stamps and Taxes are the same in both years ; but in the Post Office there has been a vast change and an immense reduction in favour of those classes who were suffering from fiscal oppression ; so that, between the two periods of 1847 and 1827, there has been a redistribution of taxation 35 to the amount of more than seven millions in favour of the working classes, to say nothing of the diminished burthen of the amount arising from the great increase in population, in commerce, and in national wealth.

Now, sir, I mention these facts—I think I heard somebody 40 cry ‘ Question ! ’—these are certainly not details very agreeable at past midnight ; but, after all, it is the business of the



case. We are told that in this country there is a system of such oppressive taxation, and of Government expenditure so enormous and increasing, that it is necessary to have reform. I do not say it is not necessary to have reform, I will enter fairly into that question. But do not let us enter 5 upon that great question upon false pretences. The rate of our Government expenditure during the last twenty years, notwithstanding the vast increase in our population and wealth, has been almost stationary. The amount of taxation has been stationary. Well, then, the pleas for reform on these 10 grounds are not true. The pleas that have been to-night repeated *ad nauseam* in every petition, are utterly fallacious and false. Now, sir, I again admit, however those pleas may affect the character of those who urge them, they do not affect the nature of the measures proposed. Let us examine 15 those measures. We are asked, in the first place, to increase the suffrage. I listened with great attention to the hon. Member for Montrose, and I certainly expected to hear from the hon. Gentleman some principle laid down upon which the franchise was to be extended, and that in asking us to 20 consent to a great change—as far as the present argument, I am not now denying that a change may be necessary; that point I am perfectly prepared to enter into—but I say the hon. Gentleman who proposes the change ought to lay down some principle on which that change shall be founded. The 25 hon. Gentleman, as far as I could gather, laid down the principle that an Englishman had a right to a vote. That really was the point of his speech. He talked afterwards of not confounding constitutional rights with the rights of man; but he did not condescend to show what the difference 30 between constitutional rights and the rights of man might be, but he said that every subject of the Queen had a right to a vote. I want to know, if an Englishman has a right to vote, why is it necessary that he should have a qualification for that vote—why that qualification should be the circum- 35 stance of living in a house? The hon. Gentleman also says every man should be of twenty-one years of age before he attains the right to vote—that the Constitution confers on him this right in return for the obedience which he renders to the laws; and, as an illustration of this obedience, he cites 40 the case of a man who, at the age of eighteen or sixteen, may



be draughted for the militia. But I want to know how the hon. Gentleman's illustration agrees with his principle, and why, according to that principle, a man who is to be summoned for the militia should not also be entitled to vote at the age of eighteen. The hon. Gentleman talks of legal age. What has legal age to do with the working classes? And what has legal age to do with any class in the country? The commander of the escort of guards to Her Most Gracious Majesty may be, and often is, not more than eighteen years of age. The hon. Gentleman has properly reminded us that every man is bound to serve in the militia before he is of legal age; and, I believe, even school-boys must join the *posse comitatus*.

Well: bear in mind that the hon. Gentleman, in proposing this great change, has laid down no principle whatever. I myself cannot understand, if you assume an abstract right to a vote, where the line can be drawn. I observe that, in a debate that recently took place, not only in another place but in another country, on the suffrage, some ridicule was occasioned by a gentleman advocating the rights of the other sex to the suffrage; but, as far as mere abstract reason is concerned, I should like to see anybody in this House, who is a follower of the hon. Gentleman, get up and oppose that claim. I say that in a country governed by a woman—where you allow women to form part of the other estate of the realm—Peeresses in their own right, for example—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts,—where a woman by law may be churchwarden and overseer of the poor—I do not see, where she has so much to do with State and Church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote. All this proves that right has nothing to do with the matter; the very plan of the hon. Gentleman is a plan that at once disfranchises millions, even of those adult males of which we have heard so much. Other Gentlemen have stated that the suffrage is a trust. I do not wish to take refuge in that very vague and somewhat canting phrase. I do not look upon the suffrage as a trust any more than a right. It is what everything in England is—a privilege. It is created by law, as everything in England is created; and the characteristic of our society has been that it has always held out

privilege, not as an odious exception, but as a general reward. This brings us to the real character of this House, and the political order of which we are the representatives. We represent the Commons; the Commons are an estate of the realm. The materials of that estate constitute, of course, a question of policy—of expediency—and it is perfectly open to anybody, at any time, to discuss the question of what that order should consist. It is an order, whether you make it consist of thousands, of hundreds of thousands, or even of two or three millions—it becomes an order and a privileged order; and for the hon. Gentleman to pretend that he is settling a great question for ever by proposing that every man who lives in a house should have a vote is an absurdity, because the very supporter of the Motion, on his own side, who has made an eloquent speech in favour of it, has argued throughout that there should be no limitation whatever assigned to the exercise of the suffrage.

I ventured to say before, that Gentlemen around me are not responsible for the Reform Act. But the Reform Act was a reconstruction of the order of the Commons—of our estate of the realm. It was a settlement most unsatisfactory to us—we offered our objections to it, and got pelted for our pains. But no one can pretend that settlement was not carried with the full support and sanction of the people of England; and if the question of its passing had been submitted to universal suffrage, there is not the slightest doubt that at the moment all would have registered their votes for the bill. No other plan was desired or tolerated. It was to be something neither more nor less. What you wanted was not only the bill, but the whole bill, and nothing but the bill—and you got it. You were told at the time that the first critics of the Reform Bill would be the Reformers themselves; and no prophecy ever was more strikingly fulfilled. But when there has been a settlement of a great question—concluded, too, under such circumstances—the country agitated for two years—yourselves choosing the hour of action—when you had every possible advantage—when opposition, legitimate, constitutional, and I believe national opposition, was entirely overcome by the energy and artifices of your triumphant faction—when you yourselves laid it down as a great apothegm that became a household word,



that you would have it and nothing else—is it unreasonable that we, who agreed to it with reluctance, or that the Whig Party, the Government of the day, who brought it forward after mature consideration, should say, before we disturb  
5 the settlement then made—‘ Let us be sure that we are arriving at a new reconstruction that offers a fair prospect of giving satisfaction to the people and security to the State ’ ? I speak, not from egotism, for myself on this subject ; for one naturally wishes, on such subjects, not to draw any one into responsi-  
10 bility for one’s expressions. I, for one, am no advocate of finality. I conceive there may be circumstances—there may be a period, when we shall do that which we have done for five hundred years in this country—reconstruct the estate of the Commons. But I contend that the last reconstruction  
15 —and it is rather a recent one, however unsatisfactory to the hon. Gentleman and his friends—is likely to be more satisfactory to the nation than the plan brought forward by the hon. Gentleman ; and I am not prepared to support any new plan, any new change, on a subject so important,  
20 unless I believe it to be one that will conduce very greatly to the public interest. Certainly, I cannot, in the character of the present plan, discover anything that has a tendency to satisfy the public heart ; because you must divest this question of all that rhetorical varnish and that powerful  
25 sentiment with which it has been suffused by the hon. Member for Oldham. This is not at all a project to enfranchise the serfs of England—this is not at all a project that tells the labouring classes they shall take their place in the political constitution of the country. It is characterised by features  
30 totally opposed to the principles laid down by the hon. Member for Oldham. If there be any mistake more striking than another in the settlement of 1832—and, in this respect, I differ from the hon. Member for Surrey—it is, in my opinion, that the bill of 1832 took the qualification of property in  
35 too hard and rigid a sense, as the only qualification which should exist in this country for the exercise of political rights. How does the hon. Member for Montrose, the great champion of the new movement, meet this difficulty ? He has brought forward a project of which property, and property alone, is  
40 the basis : he has not come forward with any scheme for an educational suffrage or an industrial suffrage—he has not



attempted in any way to increase or vary the elements of suffrage. It is impossible that any plan can be more hard, more commonplace, more literal, more unsatisfactory, or more offensive, as the speech of the hon. Member for Oldham shows it must be, to the great body of the working classes than one 5 which recognises property, and property alone, as its basis.

Now, sir, for one, I think property is sufficiently represented in this House. I am prepared to support the system of 1832 until I see that the circumstances and necessities of the country require a change; but I am convinced that, when that change 10 comes, it will be one that will have more regard for other sentiments, qualities, and conditions, than the mere possession of property as a qualification for the exercise of the political franchise. And, therefore, in opposing the measure of the hon. Member for Montrose, I protest against being placed in 15 the category of finality, or as one who believes that no change is ever to take place in that wherein there has been, throughout the history of this ancient country, frequent and continuous change—the construction of this estate of the realm. I oppose this new scheme, because it does not appear to be 20 adapted in any way to satisfy the wants of the age, or to be conceived in the spirit of our times.

I shall touch, on this occasion, but very briefly on the second point of the scheme—the ballot, which we shall have another opportunity of fully discussing. There cannot be 25 the slightest doubt that, if you adopt this new mode of registering suffrages, you at once effect a very great alteration in the character and habits of the people. That I think a very great evil, unless called for by strong necessity; that, alone, is a strong objection to the change. I do not dwell on the 30 practical considerations with respect to this subject, that, if we adopted the ballot, we probably should not avoid the corruption and intimidation we deprecate. I will not dwell on the experience of the ancient past, or that experience which, on the other side of the Atlantic, is perpetually accruing 35 to us. But, both with respect to the right and manner of voting—the suffrage and the ballot—I am surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite perpetually forget an immense element which, in the discussion of this question, ought never to be omitted, and that is the influence of opinion organised 40 by a free press. This is the best safeguard against corruption



and intimidation. You may pass what laws you like ; but the ultimate means by which intimidation and corruption will be repressed is by elevating the tone of public feeling, and bringing the influence of public opinion, through the press, to bear upon the conduct of the great body of the nation. It is all folly and nonsense to say that the present age and the present Parliament are distinguished by their corrupt practices. The very reverse is the fact. All Parliaments for the last fifty years have become less and less corrupt. But it is not your laws that have made them so, so much as the increasing action of public opinion ; for, even when you have passed stringent laws, you only did so when they were called for by public opinion, which desired to be expressed in the shape of a legislative enactment. Why, before the American War—a period not yet very remote—the Secretary of the Treasury used to sit at the gangway—just where the hon. Member for Devonport<sup>1</sup> is now accustomed to sit—and at a stated period of the Session, the end or the beginning, gave, in the House, to the Members who supported Government, a routine *douceur* of a £500 note ; which was as little looked upon as bribery as head-money by a freeman. (A Voice : ‘Walpole.’) No, no ; much later than Walpole, and quite distinct from secret bribery. It was a practice which the manners of the age and the low tone of public feeling permitted. So, you see how frivolous and unfounded are those reiterated assertions that this House is daily more corrupt, and is growing more and more so every day. The fact is, that it is becoming purer and more pure every day—inevitable in a land of progress like England, where, with a free press and a healthy action of public opinion, the undue influence of gold and property must every year and each successive Parliament be diminished.

On the third point, that of triennial Parliaments, I will touch only for a moment. Nobody will venture to maintain that the increase of taxation or the extravagant expenditure of the Government has been in any practical degree occasioned by long Parliaments. Hon. Members are well aware that, during the last twenty years, we have had on an average Parliaments of about that duration which the hon. Member for Montrose advocates. I am the less inclined to say any-

<sup>1</sup> The late Right Hon. Henry Tufnell, then Secretary of the Treasury.

thing against triennial Parliaments, because they are part of those old Tory principles which I have ever taken every opportunity of promulgating. Are they not? Did not Sir William Wyndham advocate triennial Parliaments against a corrupt Minister? They are a portion of that old Tory creed 5 around which, I am happy to observe more than one indication, the people of this country are well inclined to rally. The only objection to the change is that it is a change, and that in the present position of affairs all unnecessary changes of this kind are to be deprecated. If I found triennial Parlia- 10 ments established I would support and retain them. But I can hardly think that any sensible man can believe that Parliaments having legally that tenure of existence, which they now possess virtually, could affect the course of our policy and legislation. 15

I now come to the fourth point, which is one of considerable importance—that of electoral districts. The hon. Member for Montrose entered into some details on the matter, of which I was not myself ignorant, owing to the courtesy of a Gentleman who, I regret to say, is no longer a Member of this House. 20 I have here the manifesto of the new party on this subject. Sir Joshua Walmisley, in the most obliging manner, placed in my hand this pamphlet, as the acknowledged manifesto of the new party. Giving me credit for that candid disposition which I hope I possess, he concluded that, after reading 25 this important and elaborate document, I should be unable to resist the force of its arguments and its statements. I promised to give the work my most attentive consideration, and I have done so. I should have been happy to have expressed my opinion of the scheme in the public presence of 30 that Gentleman, and thus apprised him of the result of my perusal; but, unfortunately, that Gentleman, who was sent here to ensure the future purity of Parliament, has, from peculiar circumstances of a contrary character, no longer a seat amongst us.<sup>1</sup> The hon. Member for Montrose, in 35 speaking on this part of the question, rather beat about the bush—he fought somewhat shy of it. He first went into statistical calculations; but then he shuffled out of them, and altogether there was a confusion about his statement

<sup>1</sup> Sir Joshua Walmisley, M.P. for Leicester, had just been unseated 40 for bribery.



which showed the hand of a master in political mystification, who knows how to drape with elegance the naked truth, and when to reserve his revelations. He did not commit himself very positively to any particular view; but I have the  
5 accredited manifesto of the party here, and will take leave to call the attention of the House to it, as I think it is calculated to throw more light on the subject than the hon. Member seemed disposed to impart to it. The principle laid down in this document is what the hon. Gentleman only hinted at  
10 —namely, that the representation of England should be founded on population. [Mr. Hume made a remark.] Exactly: population, as showing the amount of property.

I will show you how that principle works, and you can then decide as to the expediency of the practice. I must myself  
15 confess a little mortification on this subject, when the late Member for Leicester called my attention to the county of Buckingham. The county of Buckingham is here set down at a certain rated rental, and a comparison is then sought to be instituted on that head between it and Lancashire. At  
20 present Buckinghamshire has eleven Members; but, under the new system, it is to have only four. Now, I am content to take Buckinghamshire to illustrate my views. It is true that the county of Buckingham has a rated rental to the annual value only of £684,000, and that the annual value of  
25 the rated property in Lancashire is about five millions, and it only has twenty-six members. I admit that Buckinghamshire has none of those great towns which we are told for the future are to govern England. But the county of Buckingham first refused to pay ship-money, the County of Buckingham  
30 carried the Grand Remonstrance; and ever since the settlement of our parliamentary constitution in 1640, of which it was one of the main creators, the county of Buckingham has supplied this House with a series of statesmen than whom no body of men have more contributed to create the Empire,  
35 sustain the renown, and cherish the high spirit of the English people. You may smile, remembering only the uninfluential person who now addresses you; but I was thinking of those days when the county of Buckingham gave to the House of Commons Mr. Hampden and the Grenvilles, the elder Pitt  
40 and Mr. Burke. Why, even at the last reconstruction of this estate of the realm, it was the county of Buckingham that



occasioned the enfranchisement of the most numerous class of the new constituency, and not the least reputable.<sup>1</sup> And is it, sir, to be tolerated that a population which for centuries has been born and bred in the memory and fulfilment of such great deeds as these, should be deprived of their hereditary weight in that free Parliament of which they were themselves among the first originators, because, if told by the head, they may not be equal to the numbers of some great town born in a day, and destined perhaps to vanish in a day? I hear a great deal in the present day about realised capital; but surely, sir, one of the most important elements in constructing the franchise of an ancient people is the realised experience of a nation. To say that you will, by a stroke of the pen, suddenly deprive of their political position a population which has so worthily exercised its rights, is not only to say that you will bring about a revolution, but very possibly produce a civil war. But how is the new scheme to act? Now, according to the accredited manifesto of the new party—[‘No, no!’]—O political ingratitude, thou art indeed a proverb! I would appeal to the spirit of the defunct Member for Leicester. [Mr. Hume made a remark to the effect that the pamphlet referred to had been printed before the party was formed.] Oh, then, it was the origin of your party! Here it is—a most important document—drawn up by Alexander Mackay, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Now, let us see how Manchester is to be represented under the new constitution. Manchester is not so scurvily treated as the county of Buckingham. Under the new constitution, Manchester is to have for Members—how many, think you? Seven! Only think of seven members for Manchester! Why, sir, from peculiar circumstances, since the days of our dreary opposition, Manchester has virtually, as far as debate is concerned, only had one Member in this House<sup>2</sup>; and, sir, as far as I am concerned, I must acknowledge it has been found quite difficult enough to keep him in order. But, if we are to have seven Members for Manchester—if there

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to ‘The Chandos Clause,’ proposed by the Marquis of Chandos, M.P. for Bucks.

<sup>2</sup> The Members for Manchester were Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Bright. The former gentleman had then accepted office as Vice-President of the Board of Trade, which entailed silence in debate,



are to be seven *Richards* in the field—if it is to be expected that we are to reply to each of them, night after night, and one after another—I at once, anxious as I am to assist and co-operate with my friends, must plainly say that I shall  
 5 retire from the arena. The energies necessary for such a contest would be colossal—worthy of the giants of the old days of parliamentary strife—the Pitts and the Foxes. But we are not only to have seven Members for Manchester, but Liverpool and Glasgow are each to have the same number.  
 10 Conceive Liverpool and Glasgow each with seven Members, and all, of course, statistical Members! <sup>1</sup> Dublin is to have six Members; and, as we always have a petition against the return of a Member for Dublin, and some of our best men—my noble friend, the Member for Stamford (the Marquis of  
 15 Granby) among them—are now working on a Dublin Committee, there will, of course, be six Dublin Committees all working at the same time. Then, Birmingham and Leeds are to have each five Members, and Bristol and Sheffield only four. London is to be represented by forty. The new con-  
 20 stitution distinctly lays it down that London is entitled to as many Members as the whole of the kingdom of Scotland, on the grounds of population and wealth. The only objection to the new scheme is, that when we have got the men together, the seven Members for Manchester, the seven Members for  
 25 Glasgow, the forty Members for London, and their comrades, we may certainly have something called a House of Commons; but then, unfortunately, this House of Commons will probably be able neither to govern the country nor themselves. It is easy to form these plans. You may go the full tether of  
 30 the hon. Member for Oldham, and have universal suffrage at once—for that is the length to which he goes. We have sufficient experience to know—recent experience—that in a country, however civilised, however powerful, however enlightened, they may elect their representatives by universal  
 35 suffrage, and yet, when they are elected, the country may laugh in their face. That will happen in our national assembly which has happened in the national assembly of a neighbouring country. Sir, as it is the fashion to lay down principles, I say at once that neither in this, nor in any other ancient

40 <sup>1</sup> Mr. Macgregor was Member for Glasgow; a great statistician, but not very popular as a speaker.



European country, can there be any such thing as government which is not based upon traditionary influences and large properties round which men may rally. They are the only security for liberty and property. The Manchester School are always attacking traditionary influences, and intimating that it is their wish to subdivide large properties. Foreseeing, as I do, what the results will be, and convinced that, without traditional influences and large properties, you will find it impossible to govern England, I prefer the liberty we now enjoy to the liberalism they promise, and find something better than the rights of men in the rights of Englishmen. 5 10

I have now shown the House, more briefly than I could have wished, the fallacy of the pleas on which the measures proposed to-night are brought forward. I have also offered some suggestions to the House, though necessarily much curtailed, which may perhaps make them hesitate before they will agree that the measures themselves are worthy of their confidence and support. I now briefly, because the hour is very late, will endeavour to show what is the real cause of these measures being brought forward, who bring them forward, and what may be the consequences of their adoption. Notwithstanding all the efforts of the hon. Members for Oldham and Montrose to veneer and varnish their scheme, and however dexterously they may have arranged their concessions, this is a middle-class movement—it is nothing more nor less than an attempt to aggrandise the power of that body of persons who have frankly told us that this is a middle-class Government, and, therefore, that they will take care of their own interests and their own objects. The House will not forget what that class has done in its legislative enterprises. I do not use the term 'middle-class' with any disrespect; no one more than myself estimates what the urban population has done for the liberty and civilisation of mankind; but I speak of the middle class as of one which avowedly aims at predominance; and therefore it is expedient to ascertain how far the fact justifies a confidence in their political capacity. It was only at the end of the last century that the middle-class rose into any considerable influence, chiefly through Mr. Pitt—that Minister whom they are always abusing. The first great movement in which they succeeded, showing their power over the people out of doors, independent 15 20 25 30 35 40



of Parliament, was the abolition of the slave-trade—a noble and sublime act—but carried with an entire ignorance of the subject, as the event has proved. How far it has aggravated the horrors of slavery I stop not now to inquire. I  
5 make only one observation upon it with reference to the present subject of debate. The middle-class emancipated the negroes; but they never proposed a Ten Hours Bill. So much for that move. The interests of the working classes of England were not much considered in that arrangement.  
10 Having tried their hand at colonial reform, by which, without diminishing the horrors of slavery, they succeeded in ruining our colonies, they next turned their hands to parliamentary reform, and carried the Reform Bill. But observe, in that operation they destroyed, under the pretence of its corrupt  
15 exercise, the old industrial franchise, and they never constructed a new one. So much for the interests of the people in their second great legislative enterprise. So that, whether we look to their colonial reform or their parliamentary reform, they entirely neglected the industrial classes. Having failed  
20 in colonial as well as in parliamentary reform—and I need not show how completely they have failed in parliamentary reform, for the debate of this night is the perfect proof of that fact—they next tried commercial reform, and introduced free imports under the specious name of Free Trade. How  
25 were the interests of the working classes considered in this third movement? More than they were in their colonial or their parliamentary reform? On the contrary, while the interests of capital were unblushingly advocated, the displaced labour of the country was offered neither consolation nor compensation, but was told that it must submit  
30 to be absorbed in the mass. In their colonial, parliamentary, and commercial reforms, there is no evidence of any sympathy with the working classes; and every one of the measures so forced upon the country has, at the same time, proved disastrous. Their colonial reform ruined the colonies and increased  
35 slavery. Their parliamentary reform, according to their own account, was a delusion which has filled the people with disappointment and disgust. If their commercial reform have not proved ruinous, then the picture that has been  
40 presented to us of the condition of England every day for the last four or five months must be a gross misrepresentation.



In this state of affairs, as a remedy for half a century of failure, we are under their auspices to take refuge in financial reform, which I predict will prove their fourth failure, and one in which the interests of the working classes will be as little considered and accomplished. 5

The principle of their financial reform is to throw the burthen of taxation on what is called realised property, which they pretend is of a more aristocratic character than other property. Upon a former occasion I took the opportunity of showing the fallacy of this position. I reminded the House that, if 10 the rental of England were equally divided among its proprietors, the average income of the holders of real property in Great Britain is only £170 a year; and as there are many possessing more, so there must be many who have less. Then, with respect to another great branch of realised property— 15 funded property—I also reminded the House that there are issued as many as fifty thousand dividend warrants for sums less than £5. With regard to house property, I presume there is scarcely any Gentleman present who will doubt that the elements of that species of property must be not less demo- 20 cratic than those of landed and funded estates. Now, suppose a Chancellor of the Exchequer—and it would be a great feat—could transfer 10 per cent of our taxation from the multitude to what is called realised property—suppose, on the one hundred millions per annum that realised property 25 produces, he could transfer even 20 per cent., what relief would this afford to a people suffering from the want of work and wages? How far would it tend to increase that want of work and wages? I say nothing of the justice of the arrangements, or the equitable contrivance of relieving large 30 commercial capitals from all imposts to the State. I feel warranted in saying that their financial reform will end in the same failure that has attended all other attempts at reform.

There is one more point to which I must advert before I sit down, and that is the source from which this movement 35 springs. The noble Lord has expressed his belief that this is not a popular movement—that it has not a great array of supporters out of doors; but then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose tells us to look at the petitions. But he assures us, at the same time, that they are all the conse- 40 quences of a declaration made by the noble Lord that the



people of England did not require this reform. Up to that point the Member for Montrose admits that the people had been silent. Surely, the people of this country are not accustomed to wait to express their opinion till it may chance to  
 5 be elicited by some captious expression of a Minister of the Crown. The hon. Member for Montrose, in this respect, proves a little too much. It would have been more frank and instructive if he had told us how these petitions and these movements are managed. I must do it for him. In conse-  
 10 quence of the organisation and agitation of the middle-class that has gone on of late years, a new profession has arisen in this country. An hon. Gentleman the other night said that diplomacy was going out of fashion. Possibly: there are people who think lawyers useless, and make their own  
 15 wills; there are others who think doctors good for nothing, and take quack medicines; and there may be Ministers of State who think that they can dispense with the services of Ambassadors and Envoys. But those who are interested in finding employment for the rising generation need not be  
 20 alarmed—a new profession has been discovered which will supply the place of the obsolete ones. It is a profession which requires many votaries—chairmen, deputy-chairmen, secretaries, committee-men, missionaries, pamphleteers, lecturers, hired orators—

25                   Rhetor, grammaticus, geometres, pictor, aliptes,  
                     Augur, schenobates, medicus, magus.

The business of this profession is to discover or invent great questions. When a great question is settled, it is the ruin of the profession. There is no need for a chairman, for  
 30 there is no chair to fill—no want of a deputy-chairman to represent his hon. friend—there are no committees to be attended—no pamphlets to be written—the lecturer is idle, and the orator is dumb. The rule, however, is, when a great question has been settled, immediately to look out for a new  
 35 one; yet to find a new great question is often the most difficult thing in the world. The profession like a new great question to loom in the distance before the old one is quite safe in port. Unfortunately for the profession, the right hon. Member for Tamworth at one stroke suddenly curtailed  
 40 their last labours. After the great question of free imports,

which they call free trade, was carried, the profession were at fault: they were flushed with triumph, but hungry for new prey. The hon. Member for the West Riding (Mr. Cobden), like a wise man, left them in the lurch and went abroad. Unfortunately for him, he returned a little too soon. However, he brought back a great question with him; and the profession were beginning to work perpetual peace when unfortunately occurred a state of general war. It was a terrible mistake; however, the hon. Member for the West Riding is a man of real talents, and he will get over it—in time. It was impossible to proceed with the perpetual peace plan after the unhappy affair at Paris—so it was shelved; and then this fortunate pamphlet happened to turn up. Electoral districts was a new cry, and served to flavour the somewhat stale pretexts of triennial Parliaments and vote by ballot. People who live in the country know little of what is going on except from the newspapers; and, seeing accounts of the public meetings that have been going forward, they have naturally thought there must be something rotten in the State; but I can assure them the matter is managed with the utmost caution and finesse—like delicate artists, they feel their way. Popular enthusiasm requires some cultivation. I will show you, on the authority of the journal that is the avowed organ of the 'New Movement,' how dexterously and with how much prudence a national demonstration is cockered up:

### REFORM MOVEMENT

#### The New League Movement in Manchester.

It is well known that the Anti-Corn-Law League Rooms in Manchester have been occupied, since the dissolution of that body, as the place of occasional meeting for most of the gentlemen who took part in the great Anti-Corn-Law struggle.

Why, did we not always hear that the great Anti-Corn-Law League was entirely confined to that single object? But it seems that after their success they have been meeting there ever since—not knowing what to do.

Newall's Buildings—the *locus in quo*—have already become memorable, and their site will, in future days, be traced with scrupulous fidelity by the local historians. Their celebrity promises to be height-



ened by fresh movements for popular freedom by the men who contended for and gained commercial liberty. A gathering of some ten or a dozen of the old batch of free-traders took place there, as we have already stated, on Thursday evening; and amongst those who took  
 5 part in the proceedings were Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, Mr. Kershaw, and Mr. J. B. Smith. Mr. George Wilson, chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League, presided on the occasion. The meeting was private, and the proceedings, of course, preliminary; but strong opinions were expressed in favour of household suffrage, vote by ballot, triennial Parli-  
 10 ments, and equal electoral districts. It was ultimately agreed that a circular, signed by the chairman, should be forwarded to all the supporters of the free-trade movement, and that when public opinion should have been obtained on the points under discussion, a more decided measure be taken for appealing to the people at large.

15 The circular adopted on this occasion was as follows:

NEWALL'S BUILDINGS, MANCHESTER,

*April 27.*

DEAR SIR,—A number of gentlemen have met here to-day to consider what steps should be taken to promote a cordial union of all  
 20 classes of reformers in favour of an improvement in our system of parliamentary representation. They feel that the increasing expenditure and increasing taxation are causes of the deepest anxiety, and they doubt the possibility of any permanent remedy being applied whilst the tax-payers are for the most part excluded from direct influence  
 25 in Parliament.

I have been requested to address this circular to you, to ascertain how far you think the extension of the franchise to all householders, with the protection of the ballot, the more equal distribution of the electoral power by means of electoral districts, and the shortening of  
 30 the duration of Parliaments to a period not exceeding three years—would afford a system of representation such as the middle-classes, now partially enfranchised, would generally acquiesce in, and which the unenfranchised classes would accept as a substantial admission to their legitimate place in the constitution.

I shall be glad also to know whether you think that at the present  
 35 time a movement is desirable in favour of the changes I have indicated, and if you are disposed to co-operate with an association founded for the purpose of promoting them. I shall be glad also to know what—so far as you have ascertained—is the prevailing feeling of the in-  
 40 habitants of your town or district on the subject to which I have referred.

The replies to this circular will not be published, and I will thank you to favour me with an answer at your earliest convenience.

This circular bears the signature of a gentleman whom I  
 45 will not call distinguished, for that would be prostituting an epithet—and whom I will not call notorious, for that might be offensive—and whom therefore I will describe as the well-known Mr. George Wilson. The newspaper goes on to say:



A very few weeks will now determine whether the country is to have a new league, more formidable than the former one, inasmuch as it will gather within its fold many sects and parties who stood aloof from the Anti-Corn-Law League in the early stage of its operations.

Now, I have shown the House, without exaggeration, quoting 5 merely their own documents, the manner in which this thing is brought about. It is factitious—it is not popular. Let me not be misunderstood—let it not be said that I am opposed to popular feeling when I say this. No: it is the same movement that has given you colonial, parliamentary, and 10 commercial reform, and now proposes to give you financial reform. It is the same movement that has always resulted, by their own confession, in disaster and disappointment. But the remarkable circumstance is this—that the present movement has not in the slightest degree originated in any 15 class of the people. Even if the people be misled, it is possible that there might be a popular movement, and yet erroneous; but this is erroneous, and not popular. But the moral I draw from all this—from observing this system of organised agitation—this playing and paltering with popular passions for 20 the aggrandisement of one too ambitious class—the moral I draw is this—why are the people of England forced to find leaders among these persons? The proper leaders of the people are the gentlemen of England. If they are not the leaders of the people, I do not see why there should be gentle- 25 men. Yes—it is because the gentlemen of England have been negligent of their duties, and unmindful of their station, that the system of professional agitation, so ruinous to the best interests of the country, has arisen in England.

It was not always so. My hon. friends around me call 30 themselves the country party. Why, that was the name once in England of a party who were the foremost to vindicate popular rights—who were the natural leaders of the people, and the champions of everything national and popular; and you must blame yourselves alone if you have allowed the 35 power that has been entrusted to you by the constitution to slip from your hands, to be exercised for other interests than the general good of your country. When Sir William Wyndham was the leader of the country party, do you think he would have allowed any chairman or deputy-chairman, 40 any lecturer or pamphleteer, to deprive him of his hold on the heart of the people of this country? No, never! Do



you think that, when the question of suffrage was brought before the House, he would have allowed any class who had boldly avowed their determination to obtain predominance to take up and settle that question? Read what Sir J. Hynde Cotton, in the days of Walpole, said on the question of the suffrage. He was one of the greatest gentlemen in the country; he did not run away every night from the House and pair till half-past eleven, and let the country go to the dogs. If it be true that we are on the eve of troublous times—if it indeed be necessary that changes should take place in this country—let them be effected by those who ought to be the leaders in all political and social changes. Then we shall not find changes carried into effect for the unblushing purpose of securing a middle-class Government, but an English and a national Government, the pride of the people, and in which confidence can be placed. Then, if you are called on to make changes, it will be in your power to make them within the scope and according to the spirit of the English constitution; because, notwithstanding the sneers of the hon. Gentleman and his friend to-night, I am not ashamed to say that I wish to maintain the constitution; and I do not mean, by the term ‘constitution,’ merely the House of Commons, and still less a particular party in the House, which some hon. Gentlemen opposite seem always to consider the English constitution. But I would effect these changes, if necessary, according to the spirit of the constitution; it is a capacious spirit—it will allow you to do all that is required, and yet maintain the institutions of the country. And indeed, sir, I would maintain that constitution, not merely because it has secured to us the benignant sway of an ancient monarchy, mitigated in its operation by the co-ordinate authority of popular estates—not merely because it has planted English liberty broadly and deeply in the land, and not made it a thing dependent on the breath of an individual, or the caprice or passion of some great city—not merely because it has secured to us the due administration of justice, safety of person, respect for property (though these are all considerations doubtless of vast import)—but I would maintain that constitution because I firmly believe that, of all existing polities, it is that system which most tends to secure the happiness and elevate the condition of the great body of the people.

### III

## RICHARD COBDEN

# INTERNATIONAL REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 17, 1851

[The discussion to which Mr. COBDEN alludes in the commencement of this speech was a motion and division made and taken by Mr. M. T. BASS on the reduction of the Malt-duty by one-half. Mr. COBDEN's motion was supported by Mr. ROEBUCK, Mr. MILNER GIBSON, and others, and opposed by Mr. URQUHART. It was met by an amicable explanation on LORD PALMERSTON's part, and was ultimately withdrawn.] 5

THE resolution which I have now to move is a logical sequence to the discussion in which the House has just been engaged. It has been said, in the course of this discussion, that it is impossible for certain interests to support the present amount of taxation. One of the actuating circumstances that has influenced me in bringing forward this resolution is, that I think it will be so far suited to the present circumstances of the country that it will tend to produce a diminution of burdens and a relief from taxation. 10 15

I wish the real scope and purport of my motion to be understood at the outset, so that it may not be misrepresented in the debate. I do not propose, then, to discuss or entertain the amount of the armies maintained upon the Continent. 20 When I speak of warlike preparations, I allude to naval preparations and fortifications. Our Army is maintained without reference to the armies of the Continent, and the armies of the Continent are never framed or maintained with reference to the army of England. In speaking of armies, 25



which I regard as the standing curse of the present generation, the matter is usually complicated by questions of a purely domestic character. I am told that the armies of the Continent are not kept up by the Governments of those countries  
 5 for the sake of meeting foreign enemies, but for the purpose of repressing their own subjects. This being the case, I am asked how I can persuade foreign Governments to reduce their armies, seeing that they were not kept up from the apprehension of a foreign foe, but in order to maintain internal  
 10 order, as it is called. Now, I believe, if I can succeed in my motion with France, the examples of the two countries may be at once followed by other countries in the reduction of their navy, and that, if a reduction in the naval forces and fortifications of England and France takes place, other coun-  
 15 tries may afterwards follow with a reduction in their armies.

I presume it will be admitted that the maintenance of a naval force beyond what is necessary, in time of peace, for the protection of commerce, is an evil; but I shall be told it is a necessary evil. If I ask why, it will be said, 'Because  
 20 other countries are armed as well as ourselves.' Well, admitting that, and assuming that France and England maintain a certain amount of naval force, not for the purpose of protecting commerce, or acting as the police of the seas, but in order to hold themselves in a menacing attitude towards  
 25 each other, that must be an unmitigated evil, and not only a pure waste; but it would be better and more economical if both voted that money and threw it into the sea, for both would then save the labour which was employed upon ships of war, and which might be more productively occupied.  
 30 These two countries will be equally well prepared for warfare with each other if they reduce their force to one as if they both maintain their force at twenty, as their relative proportions will remain the same, and no advantage can be gained, in the event of hostilities, by keeping up this unneces-  
 35 sary force.

Why do I assume that England arms against France, and France against England? I am prepared to show that it is the avowed policy of both countries to arm themselves, so as to be prepared to meet the armaments provided by the  
 40 other country. In the debate in the French Chamber of Deputies in 1846, when a motion was made for a vote of

100,000,000*fr.* for a great augmentation of the Navy, M. Thiers, who carried the resolution for this great augmentation, said :

There is nothing offensive to England in citing her example, when our Navy is under consideration, any more than there would be in speaking of Prussia, Austria, or Russia, if we were deliberating upon the strength of our Army. We pay England the compliment of thinking only of her when determining our naval force ; we never heed the ships which sail forth from Trieste or Venice—we care only for those that leave Portsmouth or Plymouth.

I am told that the noble Lord below me was in the Chamber of Deputies when this speech was made. The noble Viscount (Palmerston), in the debate on the financial statement in 1848, said :

So far from its affording any cause of offence to France that we should measure our Navy by such a standard, I am sure any one who follows the debates in the French Chambers, when their naval estimates come under discussion, must know that they follow the same course—adopting the natural and only measure in such cases, namely, the naval force which other nations may have at the same time.

In the same debate on the financial statement in 1848, the noble Lord (John Russell), after showing that the expenditure for the Navy in France had increased since 1833 from £2,280,000 to £3,902,000, proceeded to observe :

I am not alluding at all—it never has been the custom to allude, and I think we are quite right in that respect—to what may be the military force of foreign Powers. I do not, therefore, allude at all to the amount of the standing army that is kept up in France, or in Austria, or in Prussia, or in other foreign countries ; but so great an increase in naval estimates, I think, does require the attention, and, at all events, should be within the knowledge of the House.

I have two objections to that policy : first, it is an irritating policy, having a constant tendency to increase the evil, and to which I see no remedy unless it is in some way met ; and, secondly, it is a proceeding on exaggerated reports and ideas spread upon the subject of the armaments of the two countries. When these things are exposed, they always bear the trace of great exaggeration. I will mention an instance. Our naval estimates were greatly increased in 1845. The French were alarmed. A Committee of the Chamber of Peers was appointed to inquire into the state of the French Navy. They made a report. In that Report they said :



We have now to announce the execution of a great scheme which the English Government is pursuing with its usual foresight, and which cannot fail to have a vast influence upon the naval policy of other countries. (The report then goes on to state that, under the modest  
 5 pretence of providing steam guard-ships, the British Admiralty is converting eight sailing-vessels into formidable steam batteries, capable of remaining fifteen days at sea; that they will be completed during that year; and that it was expected they would be doubled in the following year.) If (continues the Report) we compare the powers of  
 10 destruction possessed by the broadsides of these floating fortresses with those of the most formidable batteries ever employed by an army upon land for the destruction of fortified places, we shall then know what to think of an armament provided under the modest and defensive guise of steam guard-ships. It is, then, for France an absolute necessity  
 15 to prepare an armament of a similar character and of equal force, so that we may have nothing to dread in future, in case of a possible misunderstanding with England.

Now, in that Report it is broadly stated that eight steam guard-ships were being prepared by the British Government  
 20 against France; and there was some ground for it, inasmuch as eight guard-ships were being altered with screw propellers; but when I sat on the Committee on the Navy in 1848, I found, on examining the authorities of the Admiralty, that only four of these steam guard-ships were ever completed,  
 25 and that, instead of being of the character stated in the Report, they were only capable of going to sea for four days instead of fifteen, inasmuch as they were not prepared for carrying a large supply of coal. I will give another illustration of how the two countries play at see-saw in this respect. After the  
 30 proceedings of England in 1845, and those of France in 1846, Mr. Ward, who was then Secretary of the Admiralty, came down to the House and proposed again an increase of our Navy, citing the example of France. The proceedings of France, he said, ought to be a lesson to us, and imposed a  
 35 great responsibility upon those who were in power in this country. But the British Government could not stop there. They ran the estimate up to 42,000, or, I believe, to 44,000 men. That produced its fruits in France. I hold in my hand an extract from a Report of the National Assembly on  
 40 the Navy in 1849. It says:

Let us see whether foreign Powers really show us the example of a reduction of naval armaments. This very spring, England has voted 40,000 men for the sea service. This vote will amount to £6,000,000

sterling, without including the cost of artillery, etc., which is defrayed out of the Ordnance estimates. We content ourselves with twenty-four vessels of the line afloat, and sixteen in an advanced state upon the stocks, for our peace establishment; the English have seventy afloat, besides those in course of building. With our peace establishment, 5 such as it was fixed in 1846, we should be one-third inferior in strength to the English Navy.

But to illustrate this point further I will quote to the House an extract from a speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Sir Francis Baring). In moving the naval estimates for the 10 present year, the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty said (and it was this remark of the right hon. Gentleman that has induced me to give notice of this motion):

It was impossible to fix upon what was necessary, in their own establishment, without looking to the establishments of foreign coun- 15 tries. He might, however, observe that they had had sufficient proof in the course of the last year that a gallant, active, and intelligent people, not far from themselves, had not by any means neglected their naval establishments and naval power.

And the right hon. Gentleman went on to give a description 20 of the naval evolutions at Cherbourg, and that great fortified place was held up to this country, with a formidable account of its preparations. I now hold in my hand a Report of a Commission of the National Assembly for the outlay of 6,800,000*l.* to continue the defensive works at Cherbourg; 25 and it bears date the 11th of April, 1851. It says:

If we would be fully alive to the necessity of no longer leaving in a defenceless state the point most important and certainly the most menaced upon the whole coast of the Channel, we have only to listen to the opinion entertained of Cherbourg by the English, and especially 30 by one of their most renowned sailors, Admiral Napier, in his recent letter to *The Times*. We have only, in fact, to cast our eye upon the map, and to observe the vast works which the British Admiralty are now executing at Jersey and Alderney for the purpose of creating a rival establishment to our own. This is the more necessary, inasmuch 35 as the railroads and steam-boats in England are every day increasing, and their powerful means of transportation give to those who possess them the facility of concentrating upon any given point a sudden expedition. We must be on our guard against so powerful an enemy, situate so short a distance from our shores, and who, by the aid of 40 steam, will be henceforth independent of wind, tides, and currents, which formerly impeded the operations of sailing vessels.

One of the best things this House has done for a long time was to suspend, the other night, the works for the fortification



of Alderney. These works are a menace and an affront to France, and are meant as a rival to Cherbourg. Now Cherbourg, as every one knows who has sailed along that coast, is a most useful, and valuable, and indispensable port of refuge for merchant ships—in fact, a breakwater at Cherbourg might have been made by subscription from all the maritime States of Europe, so important is it to all who sail along that coast. But Alderney could mean nothing but a great fortified place, within a few miles of France, intended to menace that country. Now, these fortifications arise out of a panic in England. If any one could get at the professional springs applied to panic, it would be a most amusing history. In 1845 the country was led to suppose that we were to be invaded by some maritime Power. A number of engineers had a roving commission to go along the coast and point out places where money could be spent in raising fortifications, and when they had exhausted the coast of England they went over to Jersey and Alderney. I have heard the evidence of some of those gallant gentlemen. One of them said he went down to Plymouth—he found the people there expecting their throats would be cut the next day; and, said he, ‘strange as it may appear, I shared their alarm.’ It was understood that this panic had projected our harbours of refuge, as they were called, upon which it was suggested that between £4,000,000, and £5,000,000 should be expended. It was under the same panic that the works at Keyham, upon which £1,200,000 had been wasted, and the works at Alderney, which had cost four times as much as the value of the fee-simple of the whole island, were projected. And thus it was that France had now an eager rivalry with us. M. Chevalier, in a pamphlet which he has published on the subject, endeavouring to stem this torrent of rivalry, said that while England had projected her fortifications on the coast of England, France at the same time had projected works to the extent of between £10,000,000 and £11,000,000 sterling, without including the fortifications of Paris, and he gives a comparative estimate of the increased expenditure both of France and England from 1838 to 1847, and shows that in that period England and France have constantly augmented their naval expenditure to the extent of between £13,000,000 and £14,000,000 sterling, and that both going on in that

neck-and-neck race of rivalry, the two countries have, in fact, spent nearly the same amount. Now, is there a remedy for that rivalry? Is it possible to bring human reason to bear upon that mass of folly? I am sure that Gentlemen who think it necessary to have a precedent for what they do, will admit the force of the precedent I am about to quote. I am not going back to 1787, to the demolition of Dunkirk, or to an armed neutrality, or to an arrangement made for a specific object for any armament, but there is a case in modern times bearing upon this question. There was a convention between this country and the United States to limit the amount of force in the lakes that separate Canada from America. The convention was this :

Arrangements between the United States and Great Britain, between Richard Rush, Esq., acting as Secretary of the Department of State, and Charles Bagot, his Britannic Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary, etc., April, 1817. The naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side ; that is : On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden, and armed with one 18-pound cannon ; on the upper lakes to two vessels, not exceeding like burden each, and armed with like force ; on the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel, not exceeding like burden and armed with like force. All other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and no other vessels of war shall be built there or armed. If either party should hereafter be desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice. The naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such services as will in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

It was entered into in 1817 at the close of the war with the United States, in the progress of which, in 1814, the Duke of Wellington was at Paris, and he then wrote to Sir G. Murray thus :

I have told the Ministers repeatedly that a naval superiority on the lakes is a *sine qua non* of success in war on the frontier of Canada, even if our object should be solely defensive ; and I hope that when you are there they will take care to secure it for you.

So that, in case of any rupture between England and America, the occupation of the lakes was considered by that great authority to be necessary for success in hostilities ; and



yet, notwithstanding that, immediately after the war, the two countries had the good sense to limit the amount of force upon the lakes. And what has been the result of that friendly convention? Not only has it had the effect of reducing the force, but of abolishing it altogether. When I sat on the Committee, I did not find that any vessel was left on the lakes as an armed force. I would ask, then, whether it is not possible to devise some plan, if not by actual convention, as in the case of America, yet by some communication with a Power like France, and say, 'We are mutually building so many vessels each in the year; our relative force is as three to two, and if we increase it tenfold, still the relation will be the same. Will it not be possible, by a friendly understanding, to agree that we shall not go on in this rivalry, but that we shall put a mutual check upon this mutual injury?' Lord Auckland stated before the Committee in 1848 that the amount of force left in the Pacific was always governed by the force left by other Powers. Now, I may be told that I am dealing merely with France; but there are only two countries of any importance as naval Powers, namely, France and Russia, for America had set an example, and was out of the question. When California was discovered, America might have placed two or three line-of-battle ships off that coast, but she withdrew the only one she had there, and turned her artisans and shipwrights to construct some of the most magnificent steam-vessels that were ever seen; and yet her commerce was extending, as our own is. The hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Urquhart) may, perhaps, refer me to Russia; but I contend that no country that has not a mercantile marine can be a great naval country. You may built up a navy as Mehemet Ali has done, and put his fellahs on board, but if you have not a mercantile marine you never can become a great naval Power. Russia has, no doubt, a great number of ships at Cronstadt—I have seen them all—but if Russia had power she kept it at home; and there may be very good reasons why she did so, for I have heard remarks from American skippers lying at Cronstadt to the effect that her vessels were not much to be admired. She has about 30,000 sailors, but they are men taken from the interior, unaccustomed to sea duty, and are, of course, a complete laughing-stock to British seamen. I do not consider that



any country like America or England, carrying on an enormous commerce, and with 100,000 mercantile sailors, can ever be endangered by a country having no mercantile marine. With reference to our distant stations, at all events America offers no obstacle, but rather invites us to this course by her example. 5 France is the only country that presents herself with any force upon foreign stations; and I ask, is it impracticable to carry out the same rule in regard to France that had been agreed to with the United States, or are we to go on *ad infinitum*, wasting our resources, and imposing unnecessary taxes in 10 order to keep up that waste? I may be told, probably, that this is not the proper moment for such a resolution as this. I think that it is the proper moment. I believe that nations are disposed for peace, and I am glad to be able to cite the opinion of the noble Lord at the head of the Government, 15 and of the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that there is a great disposition on the part of the people towards maintaining peace. I hold in my hand also an extract from the most powerful organ of public opinion in this country—the most powerful vehicle of public opinion in the world—a 20 paper which certainly everybody would admit has the best possible opportunity of knowing what the tendency of public opinion is throughout the world—I mean *The Times* newspaper. That journal, in a recent leading article, says:

Wars of nation against nation are not the evil of the day, but the 25 contests between classes in the same country. Europe is already so much governed by the representatives of tax-payers, that an European war is an affair of improbable occurrence. Even in countries where constitutional government is not understood, the ruling power would be very slow, for its own sake, to impose taxes for purposes of war. Eng- 30 land has remained at peace, although European society has gone through convulsions in the course of the last five years of which history presents no example since the breaking up of the Roman Empire.

If there were not a disposition on the part of the people of the Continent to go to war, where is the use or the necessity 35 of the enormous naval force which France keeps up? Surely there must be as great a disposition on the part of that country as of this to reduce the burdens of taxation by diminishing expenditure. I have conversed with French statesmen upon this subject, and when I have put it to them, as I have done 40 to English statesmen, they have admitted that the plan which I propose would be most desirable for them. They say that



they keep up their Navy because England keeps up hers, but that it would be the greatest possible relief to them to be able to reduce it. I believe that if our Government made a friendly proposal to France, it would be met in an amicable spirit. France does not pretend that she is as strong as England by sea, and she does not aim at being thought so, for it is invariably admitted in the discussions in the French Chamber that she has no pretensions to rival England in the amount of her naval force. I say, then, that if a friendly proposal of this sort were only made to France, I fully believe it would be accepted. This leads me to what I consider the strongest reason why this system should be abolished, and it is this—that while the spirit of rivalry is maintained by two countries so equal in point of resources, taking the Army and Navy together, it is impossible that one could ever gain a permanent advantage over the other. If one were exceedingly weak and the other strong, and the strong could have some extraordinary motive to oppress the weaker, I might despair to convince by argument; but the case of England and France is very different. Whenever England increases her armaments and fortifications France does the same, and *vice versa*. We are pursuing a course, therefore, which holds out to neither country a prospect of any permanent gain. We are not actuated by motives of ambition or aggression, but are simply acting for self-defence, and no rational mind in either country supposes anything else, than that a war between the two countries must be injurious to both. Every country will have an interest in putting an end to this mutual rivalry and hostility by the course which I recommend. I shall be anxious to hear what the noble Lord says upon this. I do not ask the noble Lord to do it in any specific form. My resolution merely says that a communication should be entered into in a spirit of amity with France. I do not stipulate for a diplomatic note in this form or that. I shall be perfectly satisfied if I see the attempt made, for the objection that I have to our system of policy was that there never had been an attempt made to stay the progress of this rivalry—there never had been anything done that could by possibility tend to bring the two countries to an understanding. All I stipulate for is that diplomacy should put itself a little more into harmony with the spirit of the times, and should do

that work which the public thought ought to be the occupation of diplomacy. I shall be told that it is an affair for public opinion, or for the operation of individual enterprise. Why, public opinion and individual enterprise are doing much to bring England and France together. Compare the present 5 state of things with that which existed twenty-five years ago. I remember that at that time there were but two posts a week between London and Paris, Tuesdays and Fridays. Down to 1848, thirty-four hours were allowed for transmitting a post to Paris; we now make the journey in eleven hours. Where 10 there used to be thousands passing and repassing, there are now tens of thousands. Formerly, no man could be heard in our smaller towns and villages speaking a foreign language, let it be what language it might, but the rude and vulgar passer-by would call him a Frenchman, and very likely insult 15 him. We have seen a great change in all this. In this, the first year of the second half of the nineteenth century, we have seen a most important change. We are witnessing now what, a few years ago, no one could have predicted as possible. We see men meeting together from all countries of the world, 20 more like the gatherings of nations in former times, when they came up for a great religious festival—we find men speaking different languages, and bred in different habits, associating in one common temple erected for their reception and gratification. I ask, then, that the Government of 25 the country should put itself in harmony with the spirit of the age, and should endeavour to do something to follow in the wake of what private enterprise and public opinion are achieving. I have the fullest conviction that one step taken in that direction will be attended with important conse- 30 quences, and will redound to the honour and credit of any Foreign Minister who, casting aside the old and musty maxims of diplomacy, shall step out and take in hand the task which I have humbly submitted to the noble Lord (Palmerston). I beg to move 'An address to Her Majesty, praying that she 35 will direct the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with the Government of France, and endeavour to prevent in future the rivalry of warlike preparations in time of peace which has hitherto been the policy of the two Governments, and to promote, if possible, a mutual 40 reduction of armaments.'



IV  
JOHN BRIGHT  
SLAVERY AND SECESSION IN AMERICA

ROCHDALE, FEBRUARY 3, 1863

[This speech was delivered at a public meeting held in the Public Hall, Rochdale, for the purpose of passing a resolution of thanks to the merchants of New York, for their generous contributions to the relief of the suffering population of the cotton districts.]

5 I FEEL as if we were in our places to-night, for we are met for the purpose of considering, and, I doubt not, of agreeing to a resolution expressive of our sense of the generosity of the merchants of New York, and other citizens of the United States, who have, in the midst of so many troubles and such  
10 great sacrifices, contributed to the relief of that appalling distress which has prevailed, and does still prevail, in this county.

I regard this transmission of assistance from the United States as a proof that the world moves onward in the direction  
15 of a better time. It is an evidence that, whatever may be the faults of ambitious men, and sometimes, may I not say, the crimes of Governments, the peoples are drawing together, and beginning to learn that it never was intended that they should be hostile to each other, but that every nation should  
20 take a brotherly interest in every other nation in the world. There has been, as we all know, not a little jealousy between some portions of the people of this country and some portions of the people of the United States. Perhaps the jealousy has existed more on this side. I think it has found more  
25 expression here, probably through the means of the public

press, than has been the case with them. I am not alluding now to the last two years, but as long as most of us have been readers of newspapers and observers of what has passed around us.

The establishment of independence, eighty years ago ; the war of 1812 ; it may be, occasionally, the presumptuousness and the arrogance of a growing and prosperous nation on the other side of the Atlantic—these things have stimulated ill-feeling and jealousy here, which have often found expression in language which has not been of the very kindest character. But why should there be this jealousy between these two nations ? Mr. Ashworth has said, and said very truly, ‘ Are they not our own people ? ’ I should think, as an Englishman, that to see that people so numerous, so powerful, so great in so many ways, should be to us a cause, not of envy or of fear, but rather of glory and rejoicing.

I have never visited the United States, but I can understand the pleasure with which an Englishman lands in a country three thousand miles off, and finds that every man he meets speaks his own language. I recollect, some years ago, reading a most amusing speech delivered by a Suffolk country gentleman, at a Suffolk agricultural dinner, I think it was, though I do not believe the speeches of Suffolk country gentlemen at Suffolk agricultural meetings are generally very amusing. But this was a very amusing speech. This gentleman had travelled ; he had been in the United States, and being intelligent enough to admire much that he saw there, he gave to his audience a description of some things that he had seen ; but that which seemed to delight him most was this, that when he stepped from the steamer on to the quay at New York, he found that ‘ everybody spoke Suffolk.’ Now if anybody from this neighbourhood should visit New York, I am afraid that he will not find everybody speaking Lancashire. Our dialect, as you know, is vanishing into the past. It will be preserved to future times, partly in the works of Tim Bobbin, but in a very much better and more instructive form in the admirable writing of one of my oldest and most valued friends, who is now upon this platform. But if we should not find the people of New York speaking Lancashire, we should find them speaking English. And if we followed a little further, and asked them what they read,



we should find that they read all the books that we read that are worth reading, and a good many of their own, some of which have not yet reached us; that there are probably more readers in the United States of Milton, and Shakespeare, 5 and Dryden, and Pope, and Byron, and Wordsworth, and Tennyson, than are to be found in this country; because, I think, it will probably be admitted by everybody who understands the facts of both countries, that out of the twenty millions of population in the Free States of America, there 10 are more persons who can read well than there are in the thirty millions of population of Great Britain and Ireland.

And if we leave their literature and turn to their laws, we shall find that their laws have the same basis as ours, and that many of the great and memorable judgements of our 15 greatest judges and lawyers are of high authority with them. If we come to that priceless possession which we have perhaps more clearly established than any other people in Europe, that of personal freedom, we shall find that in the Free States of America personal freedom is as much known, as well estab- 20 lished, as fully appreciated, and as completely enjoyed as it is now in this country. And if we come to the form of their government, we shall find that it is in its principle, in its essence, not very dissimilar from that which our Constitution professes in this kingdom. The difference is this, that our 25 Constitution has never yet been fully enjoyed by the people; the House in which forty-eight hours hence I may be sitting, is not as full and fair and free a representation of the people as is the House of Representatives that assembles at Washington. But, if there be differences, are there not great points 30 of agreement, and are there any of these differences that justify us or them in regarding either nation as foreign or hostile?

Now, the people of Europe owe much more than they are often aware of to the Constitution of the United States of America, and to the existence of that great republic. The 35 United States have been, in point of fact, an ark of refuge to the people of Europe, when fleeing from the storms and the revolutions of the old continent. They have been, as far as the artisans and labouring population of this country are concerned, a life-boat to them; and they have saved hundreds 40 of thousands of men and of families from disastrous shipwreck. The existence of that free country and that free government

has had a prodigious influence upon freedom in Europe and in England. If you could have before you a chart of the condition of Europe when the United States became a nation, and another chart of the condition of Europe now, you would see the difference, the enormous stride which has been made 5 in Europe ; and you may rely upon it that not a little of it has been occasioned by the influence of the great example of that country, free in its political institutions beyond all other countries, and yet maintaining its course in peace, preserving order, and conferring upon all its people a degree of prosperity 10 which in these old countries is as yet unknown.

I should like now to speak specially to the working men who are here, who have no capital but their skill and their industry and their bodily strength. In fifteen years from 1845 to 1860—and this is a fact which I stated in this room 15 more than a year ago, when speaking on the question of America, but it is a fact which every working man ought to have in his mind always when he is considering what America is—in fifteen years there have emigrated to the United States from Great Britain and Ireland not less than 2,400,000 per- 20 sons. Millions are easily spoken, not easily counted, with great difficulty comprehended ; but the 2,400,000 persons that I have described means a population equal to not less than sixty towns, every one of them of the size and population of Rochdale. And every one of these men who have emigrated, 25 as he crossed the Atlantic—if he went by steam, in a fortnight, and if he went by sails, in a month or five weeks—found himself in a country where, to his senses, a vast revolution had taken place, comprehending all that men anticipate from any kind of revolution that shall advance political and social 30 equality in their own land—a revolution which commenced in the War of Independence, which has been going on, and which has been confirmed by all that has transpired in subsequent years.

He does not find that he belongs to what are called the 35 'lower classes' ; he is not shut out from any of the rights of citizenship ; he is admitted to the full enjoyment of all political privileges, as far as they are extended to any portion of the population ; and he has there advantages which the people of this country have not yet gained, because we are 40 but gradually making our way out of the darkness and the



errors and the tyrannies of past ages. But in America he finds the land not cursed with feudalism ; it is free to every man to buy and sell, and possess and transmit. He finds in the town in which he lives that the noblest buildings are the  
5 school-houses to which his children are freely admitted. And among those 20,000,000—for I am now confining my observations to the Free States—the son of every man has easy admission to school, has fair opportunity for improvement ; and, if God has gifted him with power of head and  
10 of heart, there is nothing of usefulness, nothing of greatness, nothing of success in that country to which he may not fairly aspire.

And, sir, this makes a difference between that country and this, on which I must say another word. One of the most  
15 painful things to my mind to be seen in England is this, that amongst the great body of those classes which earn their living by their daily labour—it is particularly observable in the agricultural districts, and it is too much to be observed even in our own districts—there is an absence of that hope  
20 which every man ought to have in his soul that there is for him, if he be industrious and frugal, a comfortable independence as he advances in life. In the United States that hope prevails everywhere, because everywhere there is an open career ; there is no privileged class ; there is complete educa-  
25 tion extended to all, and every man feels that he was not born to be in penury and in suffering, but that there is no point in the social ladder to which he may not fairly hope to raise himself by his honest efforts.

Well, looking at all this—and I have but touched on some  
30 very prominent facts—I should say that it offers to us every motive, not for fear, not for jealousy, not for hatred, but rather for admiration, gratitude, and friendship. I am persuaded of this as much as I am of anything that I know or believe, that the more perfect the friendship that is estab-  
35 lished between the people of England and the free people of America, the more you will find your path of progress here made easy for you, and the more will social and political liberty advance amongst us.

But this country which I have been in part describing is  
40 now the scene of one of the greatest calamities that can afflict mankind. After seventy years of almost uninterrupted

peace, it has become the scene of a civil war, more gigantic, perhaps, than any that we have any record of with regard to any other nation or any other people; for the scene of this warfare is so extended as to embrace a region almost equal in size to the whole of Europe. At this very moment military operations are being undertaken at points as distant from each other as Madrid is distant from Moscow. But this great strife cannot have arisen amongst an educated and intelligent people without some great and overruling cause. Let us for a moment examine that cause, and let us ask ourselves whether it is possible at such a time to stand neutral in regard to the contending parties, and to refuse our sympathy to one or the other of them. I find men sometimes who profess a strict neutrality; they wish neither the one thing nor the other. This arises either from the fact that they are profoundly ignorant with regard to this matter, or else that they sympathise with the South, but are rather ashamed to admit it.

There are two questions concerned in this struggle. Hitherto, generally, one only has been discussed. There is the question whether negro slavery shall continue to be upheld amongst Christian nations, or whether it shall be entirely abolished. Because, bear in mind that if the result of the struggle that is now proceeding in America should abolish slavery within the territories of the United States, then soon after slavery in Brazil, and slavery in Cuba, will also fall. I was speaking the other day to a gentleman well acquainted with Cuban affairs; he is often in the habit of seeing persons who come from Cuba to this country on business; and I asked him what his Cuban friends said of what was going on in America. He said, 'They speak of it with the greatest apprehension; all the property of Cuba,' he said, 'is based on slavery; and they say that if slavery comes to an end in America, as they believe it will, through this war, slavery will have a very short life in Cuba.' Therefore, the question which is being now tried is, not merely whether four millions of slaves in America shall be free, but whether the vast number of slaves (I know not the number) in Cuba and Brazil shall also be liberated.

But there is another question besides that of the negro, and which to you whom I am now addressing is scarcely less



important. I say that the question of freedom to men of all races is deeply involved in this great strife in the United States. I said I wanted the working men of this audience to listen to my statement, because it is to them that I particularly wish to address myself. I say, that not only is the question of negro slavery concerned in this struggle, but, if we are to take the opinion of leading writers and men in the Southern States of America, the freedom of white men is not safe in their hands. Now, I will not trouble you with 10 pages of extracts which would confirm all that I am about to say, but I shall read you two or three short ones which will explain exactly what I mean.

The city of Richmond, as you know, is the capital of what is called the Southern Confederacy. In that city a newspaper 15 is published, called the *Richmond Examiner*, which is one of the most able, and perhaps about the most influential, paper published in the Slave States. Listen to what the *Richmond Examiner* says :

The experiment of universal liberty has failed. The evils of free 20 society are insufferable. Free society in the long run is impracticable ; it is everywhere starving, demoralising, and insurrectionary. Policy and humanity alike forbid the extension of its evils to new peoples and to coming generations ; and therefore free society must fall and give way to a slave society—a social system old as the world, universal as 25 man.

Well, on another occasion, the same paper treats the subject in this way. The writer says :

Hitherto the defence of slavery has encountered great difficulties, because its apologists stopped half-way. They confined the defence 30 of slavery to negro slavery alone, abandoning the principle of slavery, and admitting that every other form of slavery was wrong. Now the line of defence is changed. The South maintains that slavery is just, natural, and necessary, and that it does not depend on the difference of complexions.

35 But following up this is an extract from a speech by a Mr. Cobb, who is an eminent man in Southern politics and in Southern opinion. He says :

There is, perhaps, no solution of the great problem of reconciling the interests of labour and capital, so as to protect each from the encroach- 40 ments and oppressions of the other, so simple and effective as negro slavery. By making the labourer himself capital, the conflict ceases, and the interests become identical.

Now, I do not know whether there is any working man here who does not fully or partly realise the meaning of those extracts. They mean this, that if a man in this neighbourhood (for they pity us very much in our benighted condition as regards capital and labour, and they have an admirable way, from their view, of putting an end to strikes)—they say that, if a man in this neighbourhood had £10,000 sterling in a cotton or woollen factory, and he employed 100 men, women, and children, that instead of paying them whatever wages had been agreed upon, allowing them to go to the other side of the town, and work where they liked, or to move to another county, or to emigrate to America, or to have any kind of will or wish whatever with regard to their own disposal, that they should be to him capital, just the same as the horses are in his stable ; that he should sell the husband South— ('South' in America means something very dreadful to the negro)—that he should sell the wife if he liked, that he should sell the children, that, in point of fact, he should do whatsoever he liked with them, and that, if any one of them resisted any punishment which the master chose to inflict, the master should be held justified if he beat his slave to death ; and that not one of those men should have the power to give evidence in any court of justice, in any case, against a white man, however much he might have suffered from that white man.

You will observe that this most important paper in the South writes for that principle, and this eminent Southern politician endorses it, and thinks it a cure for all the evils which exist in the Old World and in the Northern and Free States ; and there is not a paper in the South, nor is there a man as eminent or more eminent than Mr. Cobb, who has dared to write or speak in condemnation of the atrocity of that language. I believe this great strife to have had its origin in an infamous conspiracy against the rights of human nature. Those principles, which they distinctly avow and proclaim, are not to be found, as far as I know, in the pages of any heathen writer of old times, nor are they to be discovered in the teachings or the practice of savage nations in our times. It is the doctrine of devils, and not of men ; and all mankind should shudder at the enormity of the guilt which the leaders of this conspiracy have brought upon that country.



Now, let us look at two or three facts, which seem to me very remarkable, on the surface of the case, but which there are men in this country, and I am told they may be found even in this town, who altogether ignore and deny. The war  
5 was not commenced by those to whom your resolution refers ; it was commenced by the South ; they rebelled against the majority. It was not a rebellion against a monarchy, or an aristocracy, or some other form of government which has its hold upon people, sometimes by services, but often from  
10 tradition ; but it was against a Government of their own, and a compact of their own, that they violently rebelled, and for the expressed and avowed purpose of maintaining the institution of slavery, and for the purpose, not disavowed, of re-opening the slave-trade, and, as these extracts show, if  
15 their principles should be fully carried out, of making bondage universal among all classes of labourers and artisans. When I say that their object was to reopen the slave-trade, do not for a moment imagine that I am overstating the case against them. They argue, with a perfect logic, that, if slavery was  
20 right, the slave-trade could not be wrong ; if the slave-trade be wrong, slavery cannot be right ; and that if it be lawful and moral to go to the State of Virginia and buy a slave for 2,000 dollars, and take him to Louisiana, it cannot be wrong to go to Africa, and buy a slave for \$50, and take him to  
25 Louisiana. That was their argument ; it is an argument to this day, and is an argument that, in my opinion, no man can controvert ; and the lawful existence of slavery is as a matter of course to be followed, and would be followed, wherever there was the power, by the re-opening of the traffic in negroes  
30 from Africa.

That is not all these people have done. Reference has been made, in the resolution and in the speeches, to the distress which prevails in this district, and you are told, and have been told over and over again, that all this distress has arisen  
35 from the blockade of the ports of Southern States. There is at least one great port from which in past times 2,000,000 of bales of cotton a year have found their way to Europe—the port of New Orleans—which is blockaded ; and the United States' Government has proclaimed that any cotton that is  
40 sent from the interior to New Orleans for shipment, although it belongs to persons in arms against the Government, shall

yet be permitted to go to Europe, and they shall receive unmolested the proceeds of the sale of that cotton. But still the cotton does not come. The reason why it does not come is not because it would do harm to the United States' Government for it to come, or that it would in any way assist 5 the United States' Government in carrying on the war. The reason that it does not come is, because its being kept back is supposed to be a way of influencing public opinion in England and the course of the English Government in reference to the American War. They burn the cotton that they may 10 injure us, and they injure us because they think that we cannot live even for a year without their cotton; and that to get it we should send ships of war, break the blockade, make war upon the North, and assist the slave-owners to maintain, or to obtain, their independence. 15

Now, with regard to the question of American cotton, one or two extracts will be sufficient; but I could give you a whole pamphlet of them if it were necessary. Mr. Mann, an eminent person in the State of Georgia, says:

With the failure of the cotton, England fails. Stop her supply of 20 Southern slave-grown cotton, and her factories stop, her commerce stops, the healthful normal circulation of her life-blood stops.

Again he says:

In one year from the stoppage of England's supply of Southern slave-grown cotton, the Chartists would be in all her streets and fields, 25 revolution would be rampant throughout the island, and nothing that is would exist.

He also says, addressing an audience:

Why, sirs, British lords hold their lands, British bishops hold their revenues, Victoria holds her sceptre, by the grace of cotton, as surely 30 as by the grace of God.

Senator Wigfall says:

If we stop the supply of cotton for one week, England would be starving. Queen Victoria's crown would not stand on her head one week, if the supply of cotton was stopped; nor would her head stand 35 on her shoulders.

Mr. Stephens, who is the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, says:

There will be revolution in Europe, there will be starvation there; our cotton is the element that will do it. 40



Now, I am not stating the mere result of any discovery of my own, but it would be impossible to read the papers of the South, or the speeches made in the South, before, and at the time of, and after the secession, without seeing that the  
5 universal opinion there was, that the stoppage of the supply of cotton would be our instantaneous ruin, and that if they could only lay hold of it, keep it back in the country, or burn it, so that it never could be used, that then the people of Lancashire, merchants, manufacturers, and operatives in mills  
10 —everybody dependent upon this vast industry—would immediately arise and protest against the English Government abstaining for one moment from the recognition of the South, from war with the North, and from a resolution to do the utmost that we could to create a slave-holding inde-  
15 pendent republic in the South.

And these very men who have been wishing to drag us into a war that would have covered us with everlasting infamy, have sent their envoys to this country, Mr. Yancey, Mr. Mann (I do not know whether or not the same Mr. Mann to whom  
20 I have been referring), and Mr. Mason, the author of the Fugitive Slave Law. These men have been in this country,—one of them, I believe, is here now,—envoys sent to offer friendship to the Queen of England, to be received at her Court, and to make friends with the great men in London.  
25 They come—I have seen them under the gallery of the House of Commons; I have seen Members of the House shaking hands with them and congratulating them, if there has been some military success on their side, and receiving them as if they were here from the most honourable Government, and  
30 with the most honourable mission. Why, the thing which they have broken off from the United States to maintain, is felony by your law. They are not only slave-owners, slave-buyers and sellers, but that which out of Pandemonium itself was never before conceived, they are slave-breeders for the  
35 slave-market; and these men have come to your country, and are to be met with at elegant tables in London, and are in fast friendship with some of your public men, and are constantly found in some of your newspaper offices; and they are here to ask Englishmen—Englishmen with a history  
40 of freedom—to join hands with their atrocious conspiracy.

I regret more than I have words to express this painful

fact, that of all the countries in Europe this country is the only one which has men in it who are willing to take active steps in favour of this intended slave Government. We supply the ships; we supply the arms, the munitions of war; we give aid and comfort to this foulest of all crimes. English- 5 men only do it. I believe you have not seen a single statement in the newspapers that any French, or Belgian, or Dutch, or Russian ship has been engaged in, or seized whilst attempting to violate the blockade and to carry arms to the South. They are English Liberal newspapers only which support 10 this stupendous iniquity. They are English statesmen only, who profess to be liberal, who have said a word to favour the authors of this now-enacting revolution in America.

The other day, not a week since, a member of the present Government,—he is not a statesman, he is the son of a great 15 statesman, and occupies the position of Secretary for Ireland,—he dared to say to an English audience that he wished the Republic to be divided, and that the South should become an independent State. If that island which—I suppose in punishment for some of its offences—has been committed 20 to his care,—if that island were to attempt to secede, not to set up a slave kingdom, but a kingdom more free than it has ever yet been, the Government of which he is a member would sack its cities and drench its soil with blood before they would allow such a kingdom to be established. 25

But the working men of England, and I will say it too for the great body of the middle classes of England, have not been wrong upon this great question. As for you,—men labouring from morn till night that you may honourably and honestly maintain your families, and the independence of 30 your households—you are too slowly emerging from a condition of things far from independent—far from free—for you to have sympathy with this fearful crime which I have been describing. You come, as it were, from bonds yourselves, and you can sympathise with them who are still in 35 bondage.

See that meeting that was held in Manchester a month ago, in the Free Trade Hall, of five or six thousand men. See the address which they there carried unanimously to the President of the United States. See that meeting held the other night 40 in Exeter Hall, in London; that vast room, the greatest



room, I suppose, in the metropolis, filled so much that its overflowings filled another large room in the same building, and when that was full, the further overflowings filled the street; and in both rooms, and in the street, speeches were made on this great question. But what is said by the writers in this infamous Southern press in this country with regard to that meeting? Who was there? 'A gentleman who had written a novel, and two or three Dissenting ministers.' I shall not attempt any defence of those gentlemen. What they do, they do openly, in the face of day; and if they utter sentiments on this question, it is from a public platform, with thousands of their countrymen gazing into their faces. These men who slander them write behind a mask.—and, what is more, they dare not tell in the open day that which they write in the columns of their journal. But if it be true that there is nothing in the writer of a successful novel, or in two or three pious and noble-minded Dissenting ministers, to collect a great audience, what does it prove if there was a great audience? It only proves that they were not collected by the reputation of any orator who was expected to address them, but by their cordial and ardent sympathy for the great cause which was pleaded before them.

Everybody now that I meet says to me, 'Public opinion seems to have undergone a considerable change.' The fact is, people do not know very much about America. They are learning more every day. They have been greatly misled by what are called 'the best public instructors.' Jefferson, who was one of the greatest men that the United States have produced, said that newspapers should be divided into four compartments: in one of them they should print the true; in the next, the probable; in the third, the possible; and in the fourth, the lies. With regard to some of these newspapers, I incline to think, as far as their leading columns go, that an equal division of space would be found very inconvenient, and that the last-named compartment, when dealing with American questions, would have to be at least four times as large as the first.

Coming back to the question of this war: I admit, of course—everybody must admit—that we are not responsible for it, for its commencement, or for the manner in which it is conducted; nor can we be responsible for its result. But

there is one thing which we are responsible for, and that is for our sympathies, for the manner in which we regard it, and for the tone in which we discuss it. What shall we say, then, with regard to it? On which side shall we stand? I do not believe it is possible to be strictly, coldly neutral. The question at issue is too great, the contest is too grand in the eye of the world. It is impossible for any man, who can have an opinion worth anything on any question, not to have some kind of an opinion on the question of this war. I am not ashamed of my opinion, or of the sympathy which I feel, and have over and over again expressed, on the side of the free North. I cannot understand how any man witnessing what is enacting on the American continent can indulge in small cavils against the free people of the North, and close his eye entirely to the enormity of the purposes of the South. I cannot understand how any Englishman, who in past years has been accustomed to say that 'there was one foul blot upon the fair fame of the American Republic,' can now express any sympathy for those who would perpetuate and extend that blot. And, more, if we profess to be, though it be with imperfect and faltering steps, the followers of Him who declared it to be His divine mission 'to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to ~~the~~ blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised,' must we not reject with indignation and scorn the proffered alliance and friendship with a power based on human bondage, and which contemplates the overthrow and the extinction of the dearest rights of the most helpless of mankind?

If we are the friends of freedom, personal and political—and we all profess to be so, and most of us, more or less, are striving after it more completely for our own country—how can we withhold our sympathy from a Government and a people against whom white men have always been free, and who are now offering an equal freedom to the black? I advise you not to believe in the 'destruction' of the American nation. If facts should happen by any chance to force you to believe it, do not commit the crime of wishing it. I do not blame men who draw different conclusions from mine from the facts, and who believe that the restoration of the Union is impossible. As the facts lie before our senses, so must we form a judgment on them. But I blame those men



that wish for such a catastrophe. For myself, I have never despaired, and I will not despair. In the language of one of our old poets, who wrote, I think, more than three hundred years ago, I will not despair—

5                   For I have seen a ship in haven fall,  
                  After the storm had broke both mast and shroud.

From the very outburst of this great convulsion, I have had but one hope and one faith, and it is this—that the result of this stupendous strife may be to make freedom the heritage  
10 for ever of a whole continent, and that the grandeur and the prosperity of the American Union may never be impaired.

## V

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE

### THE EXTENSION OF THE SUFFRAGE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 27, 1866

(At the close of the debate on the amendment of LORD GROSVENOR to the motion for the Second Reading of the bill for the extension of the Suffrage.)

AT last, sir, we have obtained a clear declaration from an authoritative source; and we now know that a bill which, 5 in a country with 5,000,000 of adult males—('Oh, oh!' 'Hear, hear!' and cries of 'Order!')—Am I to be permitted to proceed?—('Hear, hear!' and renewed cries of 'Order!')—and we now know that a bill which, in a country with some 5,000,000 of adult males, proposes to add to the present 10 limited constituency 200,000 of the middle class, and 200,000 of the working class, is, in the judgement of the leader of the Tory Party, a bill to reconstruct the constitution on American principles. In the light of a declaration such as this we can all the better consider and comprehend the 15 opposition to the bill.

Sir, I rise after one o'clock in the morning to review, as well as I am able, a debate which has continued through eight nights. And first, sir, I would gladly have passed by the defence, as he calls it, and as I must presume he thinks it, 20 which the right honourable Gentleman has made for himself and for his friends, with reference to the history of the past twenty or thirty years. I have no desire to interfere in that general controversy. I will not attempt to follow him through its details; it will require from me only the briefest notice 25



as to its general scope. I have too much respect for the time of the House to weary it, at this hour, with discussion which it is in my power to avoid; and I must say that I have too much respect for the judgement of the House, and for the  
 5 judgement of those elsewhere who will become acquainted with our proceedings, to have the slightest apprehension that any one of the mistakes, or any one of the misrepresentations consequent on the mistakes, which have proceeded from the right honourable Gentleman, in regard to the past perform-  
 10 ances and present position of his party, will have an influence on the House or on the people.

Now, sir, I am afraid that I must begin by owning that I have much to state. I will endeavour, however, to consult the convenience of the House by clearing out of the way at  
 15 the outset some misapprehensions, which the right honourable Gentleman has assisted to propagate, and which have prevailed on the other side during this debate; to these I will refer separately and at once, because I think they have considerably tended to obscure the general issue.

20 In the first place, I must presume to say a word upon the subject of the references which have been made to a great name among us, in this House and in the country: I mean the name of Lord Palmerston. It has been assumed by Gentlemen who are supporters of the amendment that they  
 25 honour the memory of Lord Palmerston by describing him either generally as the enemy of reforms, or specially as the enemy of Parliamentary Reform. Or again, and yet more specifically, by describing him especially as the enemy of that which constitutes the essential point and the very hinge  
 30 of the whole framework of this bill; namely, a reduction of the borough franchise. Now, sir, to throw light upon this subject, I will read but a few words which Lord Palmerston used in supporting his own bill in 1860. He said that the provisions of that bill were open, as without doubt the pro-  
 35 visions of our bill, and of every other bill, are open, to consideration in Committee; but he went on to use these words: 'There are certain fundamental principles in the bill which we could not consent to have infringed, because that would destroy the measure altogether. One main principle of the  
 40 bill is, the reduction of the borough franchise.'

It has been assumed, sir, by some speakers, that the life

of Lord Palmerston was a security against the introduction of a measure of Reform. I think it no less due to Lord Palmerston than to his colleagues to say that, as far as I am aware—and I presume the right honourable Gentleman will admit that, if mischief of any kind had been brewing in the Cabinet, 5 I probably should have known it—there never was, during all the years to which the assumption refers, a difference of opinion between Lord Palmerston and his colleagues on the question of Reform. I will venture to state my own view of what passed in a former year. In my own judgement, we 10 underwent a great responsibility in regard to the measure of 1860. The introduction of that measure was an important step, in redemption of a very solemn pledge, of a pledge which might almost have been said to constitute the basis of our official existence at the time. The abandonment of 15 the measure probably must have taken place at some period of the session in the state of affairs in which we stood; yet it was a matter, as to the precise time and circumstances, difficult to determine. I admit that, in that abandonment, we underwent a great responsibility. Differences of opinion 20 there might have been with regard to it; but I know of no Member of the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston who ever thought that, after the abandonment of that measure, and considering the circumstances which prevailed from the year 1860 down to the dissolution of last year, it would have been wise, or 25 even warrantable, for the Cabinet to have revived the subject of Reform. The right honourable Gentleman quotes—and grossly, I must say, misquotes—a speech of mine on the subject of the suffrage: no, sir, I will not say he misquotes it, for he did not refer to my actual words, but I will only say he entirely 30 misstates the effect. The right honourable Gentleman, however, if he recollected that speech at all, might have recollected that in that speech I declared that, in my opinion, it would be wrong for the Government to introduce or take up the question of Parliamentary Reform till there should have 35 arrived such a state of public opinion as might seem to afford a fair prospect of success. That, I believe, was all along the unanimous opinion of the Cabinet. It has been observed, indeed, that my right honourable friend the Secretary for the Home Department declared last year that we did not 40 make our appeal to the country as the patrons of a great



measure of Reform. Certainly not; we tendered no such profession. We left the country to pronounce its own impartial judgement; and we waited, in the state of things I have referred to, for spontaneous indications of the state  
5 of the public mind with regard to the representation of the people in Parliament. But my right honourable friend himself has stated that, when the elections had taken place, he individually formed the opinion, which, as far as I know, was the opinion formed by the other Members of the Cabinet,  
10 that the manifestations which had been given by the country, and by candidates when appealing to the constituencies, in respect to Parliamentary Reform, when considered as a whole, had brought again before us the very occasion on which it was our duty to become responsible for another  
15 measure of Reform. Nor have we the smallest right, the smallest ground, to suppose that Lord Palmerston differed from that opinion. We cannot, indeed, say that he agreed in it; and why? Because, at the moment of his lamented death, no single Cabinet had as yet been held for the purpose  
20 of considering the measures to be adopted during the coming session. But I do chance to know, and it is a posthumous record of some interest, that Lord Palmerston had a conversation with one, at least, of his colleagues at no very long period before his death—it may have been a twelvemonth,  
25 it may have been more; I cannot further define the time—on this very subject. I have not the smallest doubt in my mind, though I cannot state it as a matter of fact, that he was looking forward to the dissolution as the critical period when a fresh decision would have to be taken. But, as a matter of  
30 fact, in that conversation he stated his opinion that, within a limited time, it would be right for the Government again to introduce the subject of Reform. So much, sir, for the honour of Lord Palmerston, which I confess I think has not been in the most judicious keeping during the chief part of  
35 this debate. That opinion, I hope, may be expressed without offence, and without transgressing, in letter or in spirit, the rules of Parliament.

Now I come to another subject, again one of a personal character, and one with which the House has been made  
40 perhaps sufficiently familiar during our long discussion. I refer to our supposed relations with my honourable friend

the Member for Birmingham. It has been made a charge against the Government that they are identified with my honourable friend. It is admitted that we are the nominal Ministers of the Crown, but it is confidently or boldly declared that he is its irresponsible, yet its real adviser. To such a charge, couched in such terms, I shall make no reply whatever. Such persons as are disposed to admit it must have minds in a position entirely inaccessible, I will not say to deliberative reason or justice, but, at any rate, to any observations such as I can offer. In truth, such things are said not in order to convince, nor to persuade, but, if not to bewilder, at least to sting. But other and more specific charges have been made; and these it is right that, as Her Majesty's servants, we should notice. It has been stated that my honourable friend the Member for Birmingham has been the adviser and virtual framer of this bill. On that subject, inasmuch as it raises an issue of facts, and is therefore one which admits of being dealt with, let us consider what has really taken place. And I may preface my statement with this remark, that in my opinion, as well as in the opinion so gracefully, as well as manfully, expressed by my honourable and learned friend the Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge), it would have been no disgrace to the Government, if policy had appeared to recommend it, that they should have consulted the great organs of opinion in the different sections of their party, with respect to the best method of framing a plan of Parliamentary Reform. Had that method been pursued, it would have been impossible to overlook—it would have been culpable if, through cowardice, they had refrained from consulting, for one, my honourable friend the Member for Birmingham. But Her Majesty's Government felt no such necessity; and, as far as I am aware, did not in any manner or degree pursue that course of consultation. They did feel that, responsible as they had been for the formation and the introduction of previous Reform Bills, and being, most of them, far from inexperienced in conducting the affairs of a Government, they had sufficient confidence in themselves, sufficient knowledge of the state of the public mind, and sufficient sense of their own responsibility, to form their own opinion on the leading provisions fit to be embodied in a measure of Reform. We were, indeed, aware of the opinions of the honourable



Member for Birmingham ; just as much. I believe, as, and no more than, the Gentlemen opposite were aware of them. And I apprehend that we were aware of them through the same unfailing channels—namely, the public journals of the country. What we understood to be his opinions he had stated in a speech delivered by him, I rather think at Rochdale, during the autumn. We conceived them to be as I will now state them ; and my honourable friend himself will, I doubt not, have the kindness to correct me if I am wrong.

10 There were, I think, four points principally put forward. Firstly, that there was a certain franchise which must be considered to be the maximum admissible for counties, and that this was £10 ; secondly, that there was also a certain franchise which must be considered to be the maximum for

15 boroughs, and that to make this in any manner satisfactory it should on no account be above £6 ; thirdly, he considered that the extension of the franchise ought to be separated from the redistribution of seats ; and fourthly—he will forgive me if I do not quote him with sufficient precision—he thought that this separation of the two subjects ought to

20 take place for a special purpose, namely, in order that the interval of time between the two might mature and ripen the public mind after the passing of the Franchise Bill, so as to obtain, if a later, yet a more full and conclusive settlement of the later question. These, as far as my memory serves me, were the four points of opinion delivered by my honourable friend. And what have we done ? We agreed with my honourable friend in one of them ; we agreed with him in the policy of separating the question of the franchise from the

30 redistribution of seats. And should we not have been the most contemptible of all poltroons ever misnamed Ministers if, having that opinion, we had shrunk from acting on it because we might know well enough, without any gift of divination, that the leader, forsooth, of the Tory Party (as he has

35 described himself to-night) would found on that circumstance a charge of subserviency, which he himself must know, just as well as we do, to be thoroughly unfounded ? If subserviency exists, why has it not appeared in our conduct with reference to the other opinions of my honourable friend ?

40 Why were we of set purpose to differ with him in everything ? Why have we not proposed the £10 franchise recommended

by my honourable friend, and by the right honourable Gentleman himself in the bill of 1859? Why have we not proposed the £6 franchise introduced in 1860 under the express sanction of the right honourable Gentleman the Member for Calne, and declared by my honourable friend the Member for Birmingham to be the highest figure that could be allowed to stand in any satisfactory Reform Bill? If this subserviency exists, how is it that these opinions have not been followed? It is true that my honourable friend, with, I think, great moderation and great wisdom, accepts the bill as it stands; and his acceptance of it is converted into a charge against the bill itself. Strange position, indeed, if, as seems to be the case, we have arrived at a state of things, in which the very fact that my honourable friend gives his support to this bill—a bill proposing a far less popular franchise than was recommended by Lord Palmerston, whose political calmness and deliberative temper have been so justly commended in this debate; by Sir George Lewis, and by the right honourable Gentleman the Member for Calne—if the very fact that the honourable Gentleman supports this bill is to taint, and, as it were, to poison the measure itself. Is it credible that there are such extremes of party and personal animosity in this House, and that the very essence of facts and objects is to change its nature from its relation to this or that particular individual? And are these the encouragements to political moderation in his future course which my honourable friend is to receive? Such, sir, is the state of the facts, so far as we are concerned, with regard to my honourable friend the Member for Birmingham. Yet I must still say one more word about him. I am sorry to have to do it, but I cannot help myself. I do sincerely think he is a great deal more obliged to honourable Gentlemen opposite, than he is to us. It is my firm opinion, though it may be an erroneous one, that the Gentlemen who adopt the line of argument that has been adopted by the right honourable Gentleman opposite, with regard to what he terms Americanising the institutions of the country, are doing their utmost, against their will and without their knowledge—for much of what they have really been doing for a long period of time has been not only against their will, but likewise without their knowledge—to magnify and increase the influence of my honourable friend the Member



for Birmingham ; and if my honourable friend be the dangerous man he is supposed to be, and if he nurses in his breast such wicked schemes as are imputed to him against the institutions of the country, it is not through Her Majesty's  
5 Government, nor through the agency of those who are now thinking and voting with them, that he will ever obtain the means of giving effect to his fell designs, but through the line of argument and statement which has been adopted by his and our opponents, and which invests him with powers and  
10 attributes of influence such as not even his extraordinary abilities, aided as they are by his known integrity, have ever enabled him to obtain.

And now, sir, I must bestow two minutes on a question that touches several expressions of my own. Perhaps my  
15 best apology for troubling the House on such a matter will be that they are expressions which have furnished material, in the mouths of others, for some hours of this debate. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn, in his very clear, very forcible, very argumentative, and I must say, as it seemed  
20 to me—though it has been criticised to a contrary effect—by no means uncandid speech, complimented me on not having used any of those expressions which may perhaps be best and most briefly summed up in a single phrase that will be sufficiently understood by the House—namely, the 'flesh and  
25 blood' arguments. Now, sir, I wish that the noble Lord, the right honourable Baronet the Member for Hertfordshire (Sir E. Lytton), and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne, had a little more considered what really took place with regard to the use of that and of other more or less similar  
30 expressions. The right hon. Member for Calne for I think half an hour, the right hon. Baronet the Member for Hertfordshire for perhaps half an hour more, not having themselves heard me use the phrase which became for them so copious a theme, founded detailed declamation, argument,  
35 denunciation, and I know not what, upon a pure assumption. They assumed, and doubtless they believed, I had used the fact that the working classes are of our own flesh and blood as a reason why the bill now before the House should be passed. And my right hon. friend the Member for Calne,  
40 in a part of his speech which I admit was quite unanswerable, showed that thus to make use of such a consideration

would be the greatest imaginable absurdity. Undoubtedly !  
 But then it so happens I never did use any argument of the  
 kind. There are limits to human folly ; and neither here  
 nor elsewhere should I have dreamed of so eccentric a pro-  
 ceeding. I used the expression in a totally distinct view. 5  
 I used it as a reply—nay, I will presume to go one step further  
 and say, if it be not presumptuous to say it—I used it as a  
 reproof, to the language of some of the opponents of the  
 bill. And in that view I justify and abide by the use of it.  
 Sir, in my opinion there are times in debate, when extra- 10  
 ordinary errors are best met by the declaration of elementary  
 truths. When I heard it stated by a Gentleman of ability  
 that to touch the question of enfranchising a further portion  
 of the working class was domestic revolution I thought it  
 time to remind him that the simple performance of the duties 15  
 of citizenship does give some presumption of capacity for  
 civil rights, and that the burden of proof, that exclusion from  
 such rights is warrantable or wise or (as it may be) necessary,  
 lies upon those who exclude, rather than upon those who  
 admit. That, as I think, very simple declaration was magni- 20  
 fied into revolutionary doctrine ; and great service has it  
 once more done to-night to the leader of the Tory Party.  
 On the same grounds, when I heard my right hon. friend  
 declaring these working men at from £7 to £10, and that  
 not once only, as it must now be said, to be an invading army, 25  
 and even something more, to be an invading ambush, to be  
 a band of enemies, which was to bring ruin and conflagration,  
 as the purpose of its mission, into a city all fore-doomed ;  
 and when I heard these opinions, and his portentous illustra-  
 tion of them, once and again repeated, I thought it was time 30  
 to fall back upon elementary truths as the proper antagonists  
 to these extraordinary errors ; and to say, these men whom  
 you are denouncing, not by argument and reason, but beyond  
 the bounds of all argument and all reason, are your own  
 flesh and blood. And now, sir, having stated thus much, 35  
 I must so far notice the speech of the noble Lord (Viscount  
 Cranbourne) who commenced this debate to-night, as emphati-  
 cally to deny that in any one point or particular, when speak-  
 ing elsewhere, as he said, and, as has been said by others,  
 in the provinces, but as I should say, addressing my own 40  
 constituents, have I gone so much as one jot or tittle beyond



the statements made by me on the floor of this House. I do not know really whether I am to look to the principles or to the practice of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford as establishing the rule with regard to what is to be done out  
5 of the House by its Members in the use of tongue or pen. I am quite willing, however, to say, without further examination of his practice, that I abide by his precepts; and this I promise him, I will freely submit to any censure he can bestow—and if there is censure to be bestowed I admit he is  
10 a good hand at the operation—when he can show that on any occasion I have said elsewhere of any Members of this House, or of any proceeding in this House, that which I have not said here, or am not ready to say upon this floor, where in my judgement it is that all our battles may best be fought.  
15 I have however, sir, a more agreeable admission to make. What I have said in the nature of platitudes, or of truisms, or of revolutionary maxims—and the condemned dicta have passed under all these designations alternately, as might suit the tastes of the different critics—has been said with  
20 reference to declarations made by persons of the greatest weight in this House, made, too, not amid the sound merely, but rather amid a tumult and tempest of cheers; and therefore to be taken as setting forth the sentiments not of one, but of many. Yet, I am glad and thankful to admit that  
25 those cheers and tumult, overpowering as they were, did not represent the universal sentiment on the other side of the House from which they proceeded. The hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lincolnshire explained that certain cheers, which had led me to suppose he might be one of those  
30 who entertained opinions of the working class, such as I endeavoured to protest against, had been incorrectly interpreted, and really referred to another subject. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Suffolk (Sir Fitz-Roy Kelly), although he has not taken part in this debate, spoke  
35 in another discussion, upon the malt duty, a few evenings back, on the character of the working class, in a spirit which proves that he, at least, entertains none of those ungenerous sentiments in regard to them; and that tone, I feel assured, notwithstanding some instances leading to a contrary con-  
40 clusion, would be found considerably to pervade the benches opposite. But I now pass on from the brief explanation

which I have given of the particular epithets and expressions used by myself with reference to the sentiments of others ; and I think I may appeal to hon. Members to support me when I say that it was not I who first introduced into these discussions observations of this colour and description. It 5 was not in my opening speech that they had their rise ; and so long as our debates are conducted in the manner of which the speech of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Stanley) has furnished us with so good an example, I may, I hope, venture to promise him that the House will never hear from me any 10 more of such expressions, be they platitudes, be they truths, or be they fairly characterised as revolutionary and subversive paradoxes.

And now, sir, I proceed. Now, I come to take a retrospect of this debate. It is natural, it is unavoidable, that my 15 attention should first, and in a principal degree, rest on the remarkable speech which we heard yesterday from my right hon. friend the Member for Calne. With that speech I shall not attempt to deal in detail, and that for many reasons. One of these reasons, perhaps, is a disinclination to measure 20 swords with such a man.—[Hear, hear !]—That cheer, complimentary as it is, does not, at any rate, precede, but follows, my own admission. A second reason is in my recollections, and a third lies in my hopes, with respect to my right hon. friend. I cannot forget—although he may—his connexion 25 with the men who sit on these benches. I cannot forget the real services which, as a public man, he has rendered ; and while I know of no language strong enough to express the grief—nay, the astonishment—with which I regard his present extraordinary opinions and declarations on the 30 question of Reform, passing, as they seemed to do, beyond those entertained, or at least those avowed, by other Members, yet I think the evident framework of his mind, as well as his recent conduct on other questions, entitles him to this admission at the hands of his party, both that he is pursuing 35 the dictates of his conscience, and that upon general subjects his judgements are frankly liberal. I only hope that, when he is again doing battle in the ranks, and for the political objects, of those among whom he sits, he may display a little more moderation than he has done in the course of the present 40 struggle. With respect, however, to his speech, I may be



permitted to observe upon it in either of two aspects. When I look upon it in the light of a great parliamentary display ; when I consider the force of the weapons which he used, the keenness of their edge, and the skill and rapidity of the hand  
5 by which they were wielded, I am lost—indeed I was at the time lost—in admiration, though I was myself the object of a fair proportion of the cuts and thrusts which he delivered. But, sir, when I take another view of that remarkable discourse ; when I think of the end and aim to which it was  
10 applied—when I remember how shallow, how unworthy, was the exhibition which he gave us of this great and noble Constitution of England, which I, for one, really thought had struck some roots into our soil, and was fixed there in a manner to defy the puny efforts of my Lord Russell and  
15 his colleagues—when I recollect how my right hon. friend exaggerated more and more as he went on his idle fears and apprehensions, and coloured every object more and more highly in the phantom visions he had conjured up—when I found him travelling back to Australia, his old abode,  
20 and, on discovering there that the public men of that country had, after all, been simply prosecuting in his absence the career which they commenced under his auspices—when he ended with this portentous discovery, that what he called anarchy must be arrested in the colonies by the paramount  
25 power of parliamentary interference from this country, for the purpose of taking away from our fellow countrymen at the antipodes the powers of self-government which they enjoy—then I confess that the admiration I had felt was lost and swallowed up, I will hardly say in shame, but at  
30 the least in grief. Will my right hon. friend permit me to apply to him the story which is told of the mother of the Regent Duke of Orleans, Elizabeth the Princess Palatine of Bavaria ? She said of her son, what I will venture to apply to my right hon. friend. Her story was, that at his  
35 birth the fairies were invited to attend. Each came, and each brought the infant the gift of a talent. But in sending the invitations one fairy had unhappily been forgotten. She came unasked, and said, for her revenge, ‘ Yes, he shall have all the talents except one : that of knowing how, and  
40 for what end, to apply them.’

The argument of my right hon. friend depended entirely

on a series of what I may call enormous, and at the same time utterly unsound, assumptions. The first which I shall deal with is the assumption that the Government has insulted the House of Commons. Insult, vilification, degradation, harshness, tyranny, despotism—these are some of 5 the flowers of speech which have been applied in the course of this debate, I think especially by my noble friend the Member for Haddington, on the part of those whom he calls moderate Liberals, but also by others, to the conduct of the Government. But, to do him justice, my right hon. friend 10 the Member for Calne never deals in generalities; so he fastened on a phrase. He thinks he substantiated his charge of insulting Parliament by saying that I had used these words: ‘We know with whom we have to deal.’ The right hon. Gentleman says that phrase means the House of Commons; 15 and, consequently, that the House of Commons is insulted. But did it mean the House of Commons? It did not. There is no more common political artifice, as far as my experience goes, than this: when a gentleman finds himself stung, or fastened down, or aptly described, by some particular phrase 20 or sentiment, he shifts the application of it from himself, and he complains that it has been applied, and, of course, disrespectfully applied, to the House of Commons. Sir, I did not intend my phrase for the House of Commons. I will explicitly tell my right hon. friend to whom I did not 25 apply it, and, if it be any satisfaction to him, I will tell him also to whom I did apply it. I did not mean it for my right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University, or for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire, both of whom, as we perfectly well know, are friendly to a reduc- 30 tion of the borough franchise. We may, indeed, have a battle with my right hon. Friend (Mr. Walpole) at the proper time; for he declares, although I own myself unable to perceive it, that a principle is involved in the difference between the rates of £10 and £14 as applied to the counties, 35 and between the amounts £7 and £8 as applied to the boroughs. But he is friendly to some reduction of the franchise in boroughs. He has declared his opinions, and no doubt he will be ready at the proper time to vote in conformity with them. His whole conduct has been open and direct. 40 If I had applied such an expression to him I should have



been guilty of the grossest injustice. I had in my mind very different persons. Does my right hon. friend the Member for Calne recollect how, in one of his plays, that prince of comedians, Aristophanes, conveys, through the medium of some character or other, a rebuke to some prevailing tendency or sentiment of the time—I cannot recollect now what it was—too many are the years that have slipped away since I read it—but that character, addressing the audience, says: ‘And now, my good Athenians, pray recollect that I am not speaking of the city, I am not speaking of the public, I am only speaking of certain depraved and crooked little men.’ And if I may be permitted to make a metaphorical application of these epithets—confining myself most strictly to the metaphorical use, speaking only in a political sense, and with exclusive reference to this question of Reform, I would say it was not of the House of Commons that I used these words, but of ‘certain depraved and crooked little men’; and I frankly own now in candour that my right hon. friend is, according to my judgement and intention, the very first and foremost among them. ‘We know with whom we have to deal,’ because we know we have to deal with him. My right hon. friend is opposed to the lowering of the borough franchise. He knows that is the object of this bill. If I understood his speech aright—and he is so perspicuous that it is hardly possible to be mistaken—he is opposed to Reform in every shape and form; yet, though he is opposed to the measure as a whole, he does not oppose the second reading of the bill, but has been content to vote for an amendment which, in effect, says no more than this: ‘We think that is a bad bill which is already on the table, but you must lay another bad bill on the table, and then we shall be ready to consider it.’ I think, therefore, that I am justified in using the words, significant as I admit them to be, ‘We know with whom we have to deal.’ We have to deal with Gentlemen who are opposed to the reduction of the franchise, but who do not think proper to express the ground of their opposition by their vote. The course we have taken is a course that we have taken avowedly upon a principle. We do not deny, we do not dispute, that we are contending for the reduction of the franchise. We are not now contending for a particular amount. We may mean

to propose, and we may mean to adhere to, a particular amount; but what we are now contending for is a reduction of the franchise, especially in towns. But we are opposed by open antagonists, and we are also opposed by concealed antagonists. We wish to strip away the disguise from this latter class of antagonists. We wish that they should speak audibly, and in the face of day, that which they think, that which they mean; and no effort, sir, on our part, no amount of endurance, no amount of labour that we can undergo, shall be wanting to attain that object, and to take care that the people of England, as well as we, the Government, shall know with whom we have to deal.

Then the second head of my right hon. friend's indictment against us as to insulting this House was that, after we had produced a certain quantity of statistics, we declared it should not, with our good will, have any more. Sir, we never said, I never said, anything of the kind. What I said was, that when questions respecting the social anatomy of class, and the conditions and the numbers in particular of the working class, reached a point which, I say frankly, appeared to me to threaten to assume an invidious and offensive character—I mean a character justly offensive to them—what I did say was that it was time such inquiries should stop, and that, as far as the Government was concerned, we should be no party to their being carried to such a point. As to the supply of further statistics, Members know the reverse; for example, the hon. Member for Northamptonshire knows well that, on the very same night when this matter was under discussion, the Government made not the smallest objection to the production of the further statistics which he desired.

But my right hon. friend says—and I think this was the third proof he gave that we were insulting the House—he says that the information on the subject of the redistribution of seats, that is, the measure which we intend to propose on that subject, is kept back out of mere wantonness. And the task he commends to me is this: I have to show, he conceives, that the measure of redistribution is so entirely detached from the considerations applicable to the second reading of our present bill, that it ought upon no account to be given to the House before such second reading, and yet



that it is so intimately intertwined with the considerations applicable to the Motion for going into Committee, that it must of necessity be given to the House before it is about to go into Committee. Sir, I am bound to prove, and I shall  
5 prove, no such thing. It is not we who have ever held that the measure for redistribution was so intertwined with the subject-matter of this bill that it must necessarily be given before we could go into Committee. On the contrary, sir, we have frankly declared, but always knowing, as I said  
10 before, with whom we have to deal, that the great apprehension which possessed us was not one merely respecting the course that would on that night be taken by the representatives of the small boroughs, gentlemen who might be naturally and not unwarrantably alarmed on behalf of their constituents.  
15 That is a comparatively small matter. But our main dread was, that the covert enemies of the reduction of the franchise would make use of that whole wilderness of multitudinous particulars which belongs to the subject of a redistribution of seats, and would by this means perplex and entangle the  
20 entire question, so as to render progress with it virtually impracticable within the period likely to be at our command. That was the fear we entertained. But, as time went on, we found that many differed from us as to our mode of procedure, with respect to whom it would have been insolence on our  
25 part to doubt, that they at the same time concurred with us in a common object—namely, in the desire for a reduction of the franchise. Without the smallest reserve, therefore, and in deference to those wishes, we departed from the method of action which our own judgement recommended, and we  
30 incurred what we thought real hazard and inconvenience as far as the progress of the measure is concerned. We have, however, adhered all along to the opinion we originally expressed—that the safest course, could we have persuaded the House to pursue it, would have been a complete separation,  
35 for the moment, of the two subjects. I say for the moment, because I am now reminded that I omitted to notice, I believe, at the proper time, one point in regard to the opinions of the hon. Member for Birmingham. That particular opinion of my hon. friend, that the redistribution of seats  
40 was a question to be reserved with a view to an intermediate ripening of the public mind on the subject, was an opinion



that we have never entertained. It was an opinion that my hon. friend might entertain with perfect honour; but for us—as men who had formerly combined the two subjects, and as men who now professed to disunite them exclusively upon grounds of convenience and advantage in point of procedure, for us to entertain such a latent purpose would have been a base device, would have been conduct unworthy either of a Government, or of any gentleman, or any reputable man, in whatever capacity or station. And I must confess it is with pain and with much difficulty that I can allow myself to believe, that any such opinion can have been entertained of the Government by any single gentleman, who numbers himself among its supporters. I cannot complain or wonder at its being ascribed to us by Gentlemen opposite; for the distinction which the hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon has made between personal and political honour is a distinction which has been at least conventionally established to a sufficient degree to deprive us of any title to complain against charges of that kind. But I must say that, for Gentlemen who have general confidence in the Government, to think the Government capable of any such act, is a thing I am at a loss to understand; and the advice I would respectfully presume to give them is, that they withdraw that general confidence immediately, and make it their first business, not to carry an indirect motion like the amendment now under consideration, but at once to put the Government out of office by the most direct and decisive means they can discover. Thus much, sir, as to the charge of insulting the House by withholding information.

And now, sir, I hope I may say a few words as to the general charge of an attempt to domineer or tyrannise over this House. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has given me a favourable opportunity of explaining my position on that subject to the Liberal Party. If, sir, I had been the man who, at the very outset of his career, well-nigh half a century ago, had with an almost prophetic foresight fastened upon two great groups of questions, those great historic questions of the age, of which the right hon. Gentleman opposite, to judge from the last portion of his speech, seems never to have heard; I mean the questions relating to the removal of civil disabilities for religious opinions, and to



Parliamentary Reform—if I had been the man who, having thus in his early youth, in the very first stage of his political career, fixed upon those questions and made them his own, then went on to prosecute them with sure and unflagging  
5 instinct, until the triumph in each had been achieved; if I had been the man whose name has been associated for forty years, and often in the very first place of eminence, with every measure of beneficent legislation—in other words, had I been Earl Russell, there might have been some tempta-  
10 tion to pass into excess in the exercise of authority, and some excuse for the endeavour to apply to this House a pressure in itself unjustifiable. But, sir, I am not Earl Russell. The right hon. Gentleman, secure, I suppose, in the recollection of his own consistency, has taunted me with the political  
15 errors of my boyhood. The right hon. Gentleman, when he addressed the hon. Member for Westminster, took occasion to make a cheap display of magnanimity, for he declared that he would not take the philosopher to task for what he wrote twenty-five years ago. But when he caught  
20 one who thirty-five years ago, when just emerged from boyhood, and still an undergraduate of Oxford, had expressed an opinion adverse to the Reform Bill of 1832, of which he had for long years bitterly repented, then the right hon. Gentleman could not resist the temptation that offered itself  
25 to his appetite for theatrical effect. He, a parliamentary champion of twenty years' standing, and the leader, as he informs us to-night, of the Tory Party, is so ignorant of the House of Commons, or so simple in the structure of his mind, that he positively thought he would obtain a parliamentary  
30 advantage by exhibiting me to the public view for reprobation as an opponent of the Reform Bill of 1832. Sir, as the right hon. Gentleman has done me the honour thus to exhibit me, let me for a moment trespass on the patience of the House by exhibiting myself. What he has stated is true.  
35 I deeply regret it. But I was bred under the shadow of the great name of Canning; every influence connected with that name governed the first political impressions of my childhood and my youth; following Mr. Canning, I rejoiced in the removal of religious disabilities from the Roman Catholic  
40 body, and in the free and truly British tone which he gave to our policy abroad; following Mr. Canning, I rejoiced in

the opening he boldly and wisely made towards the establishment of free commercial interchanges between nations; with Mr. Canning, and under the attraction of that great name, and under the influence likewise of the yet more venerable name of Burke, I own that my youthful mind and imagination were impressed with those same idle and futile fears which still bewilder and distract the mature mind of the right hon. Gentleman. I had conceived that very same fear, that ungovernable alarm at the first Reform Bill, in the days of my undergraduate career at Oxford, which the right hon. Gentleman now feels at the measure before the House; and the only difference between us is this—I thank him for bringing it into view by his quotation—that, having those views, I, as it would appear, moved the Oxford Union Debating Society to express them clearly, plainly, forcibly, in downright intelligible English; while the right hon. Gentleman does not dare to let the nation know what it is that he really thinks, but is content to skulk under the shelter of the meaningless amendment which is proposed by the noble Lord. And now, sir, I quit the right hon. Gentleman; I leave him to his reflections; and I envy him not one particle of the polemical advantage which he has gained by his discreet reference to the proceedings of the Oxford Union Debating Society in the year of grace 1831.

My position, then, sir, in regard to the Liberal party, is in all points the opposite of Earl Russell's. Earl Russell might have been misled possibly, had he been in this place, into using language which would have been unfit if coming from another person. But it could not be the same with me. I am too well aware of the relations which subsist between the party and myself. I have no one of the claims which he possesses in such abundance. I came among you an outcast from those with whom I associated, driven from their ranks, I admit, by no arbitrary act, but by the slow and resistless forces of conviction. I came among you, to make use of the legal phraseology, *in formâ pauperis*. I had nothing to offer you but faithful and honourable service. You received me, as Dido received the shipwrecked Æneas:

Ejectum littore, egentem  
Accepi;



and I only trust you may not hereafter at any time have to complete the sentence in regard to me :

*Et regni, demens ! in parte locavi.*

You received me with kindness, indulgence, generosity, and, 5 I may even say, with some measure of your confidence. And the relation between us has assumed such a form that you can never be my debtors, but that I must be for ever in your debt. It is not from me, under such circumstances, that any word will proceed that can savour of the character which 10 the right hon. Gentleman imputes to the conduct of the Government with respect to the present bill. And now, sir, let me state what I take to be the actual condition of the question that is to be decided to-night. For this is not only a brilliant and a protracted debate, it is not only one upon 15 which the House of Commons has freely lavished from every one of its parties or its sections the choicest treasures of its wit, its argument, its rhetorical and its persuasive powers ; it is also an historical debate. We are now about the process which is called 'making history.' We are now laying the 20 foundations of much that is hereafter to happen. This occasion is a starting-point, from which I presume to think the career we have to run, as individuals and as parties, will in many respects take its character and colour. Now, sir, the main charge brought against us is this : that we have 25 introduced a Franchise Bill alone. Is that, then, such a very grave offence ? There were two reasons that might, surely, and without reproach, have moved us to take such a course. One was the reason of policy ; the desire to avoid giving temptation, unnecessarily, for a combination of persons 30 formed from various and opposite quarters, and uniting, though on different grounds, for the common but momentary purpose of rejecting the bill. If we were influenced by that motive I do not know that, in confessing the fact, we need in any way be ashamed of it. But the conclusive reason which 35 swayed us was that which I mentioned in introducing the bill, the feeling that the passing of a combined bill must be regarded as practically impossible ; that, under the circumstances which then existed, it was not wise for us to ask the House to continue its sittings through the autumn ; that the time which we must reckon as likely to be consumed in

debate upon the double measure would be more than we could make sure, within the ordinary limits of the session, we should be able to devote to it; and that, consequently, if we should introduce a measure which we knew could not, in the ordinary course of things, pass the House in the time 5 available for its discussion, not only would there be another failure to be added to the already long list of parliamentary miscarriages, but a failure, too, attended on our part with gross dishonour. We should have met with all, and more than all, the opposition which has encountered us, although 10 not, perhaps, from the same quarters. And we should have had, to boot, the reproach from within, that we had adopted an indirect method of proceeding, and had claimed credit for being the friends of Reform, while we had laid upon the table a measure which we ourselves knew it was impossible to 15 carry through. This second and conclusive reason was, then, the question of time. It was the twelve-day or twenty-four day argument, which has attained such considerable celebrity; and on which my mind dwells with peculiar satisfaction, because it seems to have been the only point of all those 20 mooted in this debate on which everybody has been agreed. No one, at least, has challenged it.

That argument of time was also for us, under the circumstances, an argument of honour; and the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn has fairly owned that the alternative 25 to our method of proceeding was the postponement of the whole question to next session. Now, after what has passed, let the noble Lord place himself in our position. I ask the noble Lord, for I have confidence in his fairness, to place himself in our position. We were the authors, most of us, of 30 measures which had resulted in two or three former failures. We had taken part, most of us, in the strong and decisive measure which resulted in the ejection of the Government of Lord Derby upon a bill relating to this very same subject. We had postponed, for several years after that resolution, 35 the resumption of the subject which had been dropped in 1860. We found, upon inquiry last autumn, that we could obtain, in time to legislate, all the information which appeared to us to be needed in order to enable Parliament to deal with the franchise. Was it, then, so great an offence, an offence 40 which deserved to be visited with such severity, that we



thought it more honourable to ourselves, and more honourable to our party, to do at once that which we found we could do at once, and to postpone to a later stage that which absolutely required to be postponed? Was it so strange a thing that, 5 after four Reform Bills had failed, and failed egregiously, we should think of varying their form, of removing some of the cargo from the ship? Was not that, indeed, the natural course to pursue, when it had been found impossible to navigate her with the whole of it aboard?

10 And again, sir, had the House of Commons evinced a deliberate determination on former occasions only to deal with the extension of the franchise and the redistribution of seats as one measure, the case would have been different. But no such determination had been announced; nor can any such 15 opinion be found upon the records, or inferred from the acts, of the House. In the many debates which have taken place upon the bill with respect to the county franchise, introduced by my hon. friend the Member for West Surrey, it was never urged that that measure must of necessity be combined with 20 a proposal for the redistribution of seats, nor have suggestions of this kind been ordinarily made, if my memory serves me right, in the debates which have taken place upon the bill introduced by my hon. friend the Member for Leeds to effect a reduction of the franchise in boroughs. Again, sir, is not 25 our legislation for Ireland a case eminently in point? Does not Ireland present to us the very smallest borough constituencies in the kingdom? And yet we proceeded without scruple, or difference among ourselves, in the case of Ireland, in the very same manner we have now adopted. We added 30 100,000 or 150,000, or, as I have seen it stated, a yet larger number, of voters to the constituencies of Ireland; and still we have never touched the question of redistribution at all. And yet, because the Government have adopted a similar course, our conduct is regarded as something monstrous, and 35 as justifying every kind of strange and dishonouring suspicion.

And now, sir, I will turn to another head of evidence. Let us see what hon. Gentlemen say when they go to their constituents. That is a description of evidence to which, in my opinion, much weight should be attached, because the 40 sentiments of hon. Gentlemen on such occasions are dictated not only by reason but by instinct—by that instinct which,

as an inward monitor, teaches them what to say when they come before the arbiters of their fate. I have been rather curious in examining the Addresses of hon. Gentlemen, and I find that there were 117 borough Members who entered into particulars on the subject of Reform, and who were not content with a mere reference to it in general terms. Out of these, no more than sixteen referred at all to the question of the redistribution of seats; and I believe that every one of those sixteen Members, who have testified in this unequivocal manner to their belief in the importance of redistribution of seats, is going to vote with the Government in favour of the present bill. The remaining 101 declared themselves at the election upon the franchise alone. Whether some of them may since have become conscious of the great importance of the redistribution of seats I do not know; but, on referring to the names, I find that the vast majority of those who think the subject of Reform is worth introducing at all refer to it, while making their profession of a political creed, simply in connection with what we hold to be its most important branch, namely, the extension of the franchise. Therefore, sir, I must say I do not think it can be shown that any great reproach can attach to the Government for the course which it has pursued.

Now, sir, I come to the language that has been held about the inconvenience of the separation. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Stanley) has argued this part of the question (to use the common phrase) very high. I do not blame the noble Lord for what I certainly thought a strain of great exaggeration. I will only say this: I doubt whether it was altogether consistent in the speaker of the speech. For what was the noble Lord's own course in 1859? The noble Lord objects to anything lying in prospect only; he wants to have everything in hand. Is that really so? There are two heads under which his objection arises; one is with respect to boundaries; and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) has shown to-night that this is much the greater of the two in his opinion. The other has reference to the redistribution of seats. How did the noble Lord himself stand in 1859, with respect to the question of boundaries? Though the Government, of which he was a member, had been twelve months in office when they brought in their bill, though they



had had ample time for ascertaining all the facts, and for proposing an exact system of delimitation to Parliament, they made no such proposal; all they did was to insert a clause in general words, directing that inquiries should be  
5 made, which inquiries were to be made after the bill for Reform should have passed, and were then to be followed by a bill for fixing boundaries. So that, as to this head, the noble Lord now flings at us, as a charge, the very thing which in 1859 he did himself. And what did he do with respect to  
10 redistribution? He put only fifteen seats in his bill. It was not much, but it was the best part of the measure. The other provisions of the bill of 1859 were such as I would rather not now describe. Well, the noble Lord with his colleagues dealt, by his bill, with fifteen seats; and, having thus satisfied  
15 himself, he also proposed to fix a certain rate for the borough and county franchise; and then he held to the House language to this effect: 'Though we give you only fifteen seats now, it is because we cannot do more at present; but, if you look at the borough and county franchise, you will see that, as  
20 they are now to be identified, by and by you can redistribute seats as much as you like.' Thus, having by the bill thrown the entire question of boundaries bodily into the future, and having left the question of redistribution, in a great measure, to stand over for its real settlement at some time  
25 perfectly undetermined, the noble Lord now comes down and delivers this admirable speech—admirable except because he was the speaker of it—on the intolerable inconvenience of making any separation at all between the question of the franchise and the determination of the constituencies among  
30 which the seats are to be divided.

And now, sir, I wish to say one word on an illustration used by the noble Lord. Not the figure about the building of a house; for that was well answered by my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General for Scotland, who re-  
35 minded him that we were not going to build a house at all, for we have got a very good one already. But I refer to the illustration which the noble Lord drew from the subject of finance. Said the noble Lord, 'In finance you would never proceed as you are now proceeding, for in finance the House  
40 always has the whole scheme of the year before it.' But does the noble Lord forget that controversy, of historic fame,

which closed about four or five years ago, when, for the special purpose of the protection of its privileges, the House thought fit to unite all the taxes and all the chief financial measures for the year in one bill? Until that year the practice had been to pass the various financial proposals as independent 5 bills, subject to all the risks which the noble Lord described, and all the dangers and inconveniences which he conjured up, and presented to our view as attendant upon severances of this kind. But who were the defenders of that separate legislation? Why, all its defenders came from behind the 10 noble Lord; they were the very same men who to-night, I suppose, will crowd one of the lobbies of the House to sustain a vote in extravagant contrariety to the principle for which they then contended.

My right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University 15 made what I must frankly call a commendable, and in intention a helpful suggestion. Why do not you proceed by resolution? he asked. I thank him for his inquiry, because I am certain of the spirit in which that suggestion was offered. But had my right hon. friend thought of 20 the real meaning of proceeding by resolution? We could easily conceive, I think, how our first resolution would be framed; it might be very short, for the subject would not require much detail. Again, it would be easy to put into a few resolutions so much of the bill as related to the fran- 25 chise; but I want to know how he would have put the redistribution of seats into the form of resolutions? Would he have a resolution declaring that it is expedient to take away so many Members from thirty or forty boroughs? and, if so, would he name those boroughs? If he did not name 30 them, the resolution would be meaningless, a shot fired in the air; and if he did name them, what, I ask, would be the difference between the resolution and a bill for redistribution, so far as regards the main point in issue—namely, the gaining time by avoiding multiplied topics of debate. No- 35 thing would be gained by that course. I fully appreciate the suggestion, but I am bound to say I do not think we have incurred any evil result, or have deserved any blame, in not adopting it.

Now, sir, what is the real state of the case with regard to 40 redistribution of seats? This is very much at the root of



our present difficulty. My hon. friend the Member for Birmingham has said truly that it is conceivable that you might have a scheme of redistribution such as altogether to frustrate and to intercept the effect of any given reduction of the franchise. If we were to introduce a scheme of that kind, I admit that everything that has been said against us would be just. But, sir, we are not as persons who have given no indication in former times of their views of redistribution. My belief is that redistribution, though an exceedingly important subject, is, under existing circumstances, secondary altogether to the franchise; because it is limited by and regulated upon principles, which I think afford little room for difference of opinion among fair-minded and moderate men. The redistributions of the bill of 1854, of the bill of 1859, and of the bill of 1860, have proceeded upon one and the same set of principles, namely, to abridge the representation in one portion of our system by taking Members from the boroughs of small populations, and to divide the seats thus obtained, in such proportions as might be thought fair, between the new towns, and such of the counties and large towns already represented as might appear to have just claims to an increase of representation. Such are the principles; but, of course, there must be some variety in the mode of applying them. In that view of the subject I think any reasonable man will see that our principles of redistribution, at least, comprise nothing at all that can vitally affect in any manner a bill which extends the franchise. The bill, I think, of the right hon. Gentleman and Lord Derby proposed to enfranchise seven towns. Birkenhead has since been enfranchised; but six of those boroughs still remain, and their population averages 20,000, so that altogether their population numbers 120,000. Take, then, 120,000 people out of the counties; what is the number of £7 voters which would by such a measure be brought into existence? It is not worth considering for a moment. One distinguished speaker opposite did, indeed, I think, state that there were two or three millions of people in the counties that might properly be withdrawn from them, and included within the towns. I grant that if you approach the subject of redistribution with the intention of what is commonly called 'cooking the constituencies,' you will, by seeking to destroy the effects of the

reduction of the franchise through the redistribution of seats, make redistribution a most dangerous engine as regards public liberty. We disclaim and condemn all such intentions. I think our former conduct ought to acquit us of any such intentions. But, if such intentions be imputed 5 to us, it ought to be by our enemies; for such intentions as these are surely not to be imputed compatibly with political friendship. We consider it to be the proper purpose of redistribution by moderate and reasonable changes to second the provisions of the law touching the franchise, not covertly 10 to neutralise and overturn them.

Now, sir, we have been asked to do some things, and we have done them. But let us just consider what they are, and what they are not. It has been stated, and stated assiduously, that we have said that redistribution must be 15 postponed for another year, and that nothing can be done on that subject until the Franchise Bill became law. We have said neither one nor the other. We have never refused any request or suggestion to proceed with redistribution during the present year. We have said that we should not 20 proceed with the plan of redistribution, until in our judgment the fate of the Franchise Bill had been secured. But that is a very different thing. That security may become apparent at one or at another stage of the progress of a measure through Parliament, according as circumstances happen, which can 25 only be judged of at the moment. But as to the necessary postponement of the Redistribution Bill for another year, we have not said anything of the sort. I myself, in the name of the Government, distinctly pointed out that if it were the pleasure of the House, in its anxiety for a prompt settle- 30 ment of the whole subject of Reform, to prolong its sittings during the autumn, the Government would not be the parties to object. But, strange to say, although that offer was intelligibly stated, not a single one of the Gentlemen who are so keen for considering redistribution together with the 35 question of the franchise, has let fall one syllable showing a disposition to agree to that proposal. We said that in our opinion the redistribution of seats formed an essential part of Reform; we said that the political engagement, on which we stake our existence as a Government, is not confined to 40 the Franchise Bill, but extends to the subject of redistribu-



tion ; and we said that the process of redistribution, if there were a mind to undertake it with promptitude and dispose of it with dispatch, should not be intercepted by any tardiness or laziness of ours. We are taunted, and not altogether  
5 unjustly, by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Disraeli) with having changed our front, because we have made this further concession, in order to meet the views of Gentlemen whom we believe to be united with ourselves in the object that we have in view, that we will lay the bill for the redis-  
10 tribution of seats upon the table, before asking the House to go into Committee upon the bill relating to the franchise. And now, sir, I may fairly ask, what more is desired ? Let us hear what is asked ; in order that we may consider whether, compatibly with the main design we have in view, we can  
15 give our assent to the demand. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn says, ' Give us a guarantee that, if the Franchise Bill passes, the Redistribution Bill shall also pass.' Is the noble Lord so much afraid of the consequences of failure as to forget that, if our plan of redistribution fails, the Govern-  
20 ment must fail with it, and consequently that, if he is so keen for redistribution, he can come into power himself and carry some plan of his own ? The noble Lord, it seems, is afraid of a dissolution. But there can, I think, be nothing more obvious than this, that the Government, having pro-  
25 duced these two bills, will have every conceivable motive of a selfish kind for avoiding a dissolution, until both the one and the other shall have passed. For, while we shall have conciliated a few, on the other hand—proceed as cautiously as we may—we shall have offended many. If you think we  
30 may have some favour and interest with the constituencies likely to be enfranchised, it is in your power to gain as great an interest in them, should you but have the wisdom and forethought to desist from the course that you are now pursuing, and to show a little less mistrust of them, of that  
35 portion of your fellow countrymen ; should you, for example, henceforward refrain from insisting that to allow them to possess the franchise is to Americanise the institutions of the country.

I wish, sir, to be clearly understood upon the question  
40 connected with the form and manner of proceeding with the measure, especially after it has been repeatedly stated in



debate that there are various rumours circulating in the House. I believe there are Gentlemen who desire of us more than we have promised to do ; who are not satisfied with our having said that the Redistribution Bill should be placed in their possession immediately after the second reading of the measure that is now before them. Let me endeavour, then, to be clear upon this subject. Our object is to draw a separation broadly and unequivocally between those who really desire a reduction of the franchise in counties, and above all, in boroughs, and those who do not, but who are apparently disposed to make use of the question of the redistribution of seats, and of every other topic, for the purpose of concealing their hostility, and yet of effectively prosecuting their opposition to the reduction of the franchise. Now, sir, I have to say that the Government will be loth to quarrel upon any mere question of procedure with any Gentleman in whom we recognise a community of object and purpose with ourselves. If Gentlemen have but the same end in view, we shall have every disposition, as far as we can contrive it, to adopt the same means. We hold every subject of procedure to be wholly secondary to the purpose for which it is intended. What we cannot do, however, is this : we cannot undertake to abandon the ground we have gained, for, in my opinion, we have gained ground. We will not undertake to forgo the fruit of those labours which the House has bestowed on the subject during that part of the session which is past ; and we cannot undertake to waste that portion of the session which is yet to come. We will not, as far as depends upon us, either encourage or endure mere procrastination. I must in the plainest manner convey to my noble friend the Member for Chester that we will be no parties to procrastination ; and that no concealment shall subsist if we have the power to pierce it through, and to unveil to the public whatever may lie beneath. That, sir, is the state of the case with regard to our intentions upon what may happen after the second reading of this bill.

Now, sir, in a great question like this, it is well understood what is really involved in the second reading. Let it be clearly understood that we are not now debating the rejection or acceptance of clauses secondary with reference to the main purpose of the bill. It is no question of Savings Banks, it is



no question of the dockyard suffrage ; nor is it even a question concerning the votes of leaseholders in counties. And here I will, in passing, make an admission to my right hon. friend the Member for North Staffordshire. He has certainly  
5 surprised me by the number of votes which he believes would be added to the Register of a particular division of a county under the operation of this clause. I do not know that his estimate is precisely correct ; I may have occasion to question it. We have proposed the clause I am referring to under the  
10 belief that, as a general and almost universal rule, the number of those leaseholding votes will be comparatively small. If that be not so, it is a question undoubtedly open to reconsideration.

Nor, of course, are we at this moment asking of any Gentle-  
15 man to pledge himself as to the particular figure, at which he will fix the reduced franchise in counties, nor even in boroughs. We do not conceal our intentions, especially about the suffrage in towns. We do not hold out the smallest expectation that we shall deviate from our position in this  
20 respect ; we cannot depart from it. But that is not the point to be decided to-night. The point we are to decide to-night is whether the House will, by a majority, vote for the second reading of this bill—that is to say, for a measure affirming the reduction of the franchise in counties, and  
25 especially in towns. That is the question. [‘No, no!’] It may not be the question in the estimation of the hon. Gentleman ; but it seems not improper that those who move the second reading of a bill should at any rate put the House in possession of what they know to be the intentions of the  
30 movers, and what they believe to be, and, so far as depends on them, intend should be, the true significance of the vote for which they ask. Have we, then, good reason for asking that this bill should be read a second time, in lieu of adopting the motion of the noble Earl ? I think we have very sound  
35 reasons for asking it. They are these. We gave notice that we would introduce a measure of Reform, and we produced the bill. We were saluted by my noble friend with a hostile motion, and a motion framed in concert with the party in opposition. On a former occasion I endeavoured to do  
40 justice to the moderation of my noble friend’s character ; I wish now to bear testimony also to the moderation and

mildness of his language. But the moderation and mildness of his language cannot blind the Government to the severity of his act. He spoke of his being a follower of Earl Russell; but the amendment, coming as it does from my noble friend, has been concerted with the party opposite. [An hon. 5 Member: 'I do not believe it was.'] I am bound to say that I am unable to recognise the hon. Member as the leader of the party opposite. I recognise the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks as filling that position, and no one else. But, returning to the amendment; I am not aware of any 10 case, within our parliamentary experience, or of any case whatever, in which a Government has consented to accept such an amendment, so prepared and so produced. I frankly own that, if I were to be dragged at the chariot-wheels of any man, I would be as willing to be dragged at the chariot-wheels 15 of my noble friend as at those of any one whom I have the honour to know. But that is a process to which a Government cannot, and must not, submit. I marked the words of my noble friend, as he looked back at his own conduct in 1859. He was then so zealous for a reduction of the borough 20 franchise that he would not hear of the proposal to read the bill of that day for a second time, because it did not propose such reduction. My noble friend now repents of that refusal. He says it was a very unwise proceeding. He holds that, having then before them a Government which had introduced 25 a Reform Bill, and which was pledged to stand or fall by it, to stop the Government in its career was not the way to promote the cause of Reform. Yet, strange inconsistency of human nature, not peculiar to my noble friend, but only too common in the annals of casuistry and of conscience! for a 30 moment, and with evident sincerity, he repents; but, at the same moment, the temptation again presents itself, and again he falls. In the very act of making the confession he revives and repeats the offence. My noble friend now in truth asks the House to do over again what he laments that 35 he did in 1859. We, on our part, ask that our bill may be read a second time. Is our request an unfair one? My right hon. friend the Member for Calne quoted yesterday, and with great effect, a phrase which has been used by Mr. Hallam. Mr. Hallam says, very truly, that Ministers have a double 40 allegiance: an allegiance to the Crown, and an allegiance to



this House. It is their business, in submitting their measures to the judgement of the House, to consider what their own honour requires ; but it is also their duty, in deciding as they best can what is expedient for the public interests, to consider  
 5 what may be required for the honour, dignity, and efficiency of the House. Well, sir, after all that has happened ; after the many bills which have been brought in ; after the many unforeseen obstacles, ending in miscarriage ; after the equivocal and questionable proceedings that have at times been  
 10 taken with reference to these measures, and the jealousies and reproaches, which the public do not understand, but of which they see the effect in the total stoppage of the movement of Reform ; we have deliberately thought that we were entitled, nay that we were bound, to ask the House for  
 15 an answer on the broad question respecting a reduction of the franchise in counties and boroughs—a question which cannot be affected in its substance by any course that we can pursue with regard to the redistribution of seats. That is what we have thought ; and I think I may ask my noble  
 20 friend whether we are not perfectly entitled to ask for that answer, with reference not to our own convenience or even our own credit, but to the honour, dignity, and efficiency of the House itself.

Sir, there was a wish expressed by one of the heroes of that  
 25 ancient war to which my right hon. friend and myself have so often referred, a wish eminently suitable to the present position of Her Majesty's Government. It is this :

Let us die in the daylight.

Now, I humbly ask of my noble friend, that we may die in  
 30 the daylight. My noble friend's hostility to this bill—the fact of such hostility is, I fear, notorious, for it was pretty intelligibly declared in his address to his constituents—is not founded upon the circumstance of its not containing clauses for redistribution, but on the fact of its being a bill for an  
 35 effective reduction of the franchise in boroughs. My noble friend differs vitally from the Government on that subject. I do not complain of that difference of opinion. On the contrary, I honour him for acting according to his own convictions. But I do not think it too much to ask that he  
 40 should state it in plain words. He asks, however, for a

Redistribution Bill, to be joined with the Franchise Bill. But, suppose a Redistribution Bill of an unobjectionable character were introduced, would my noble friend then support the Franchise Bill?—I think that is a fair challenge. I think that upon the answer to that challenge, or upon the non-answer to it, which will mean pretty much the same thing, the judgement of the House and of the country may very well be taken.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne has said that we have given no reasons for our bill; and he likewise said that we know nothing of those 204,000 persons whom it is proposed to enfranchise in boroughs; indeed, as I think, he repeated the assertion several times. What, sir, do we know nothing of those 204,000? If we are thus ignorant, yet does my right hon. friend know nothing of them? We were taught to think he knew a good deal about them. We have not yet wholly forgotten his own significant words, so loudly cheered: 'We know what sort of men live in these houses.' My right hon. friend will recollect the words well enough. They were used in his first speech. They formed part of his declamatory denunciation against the admission of any class below the £10 voters to the franchise. Nor was this all. Who were those Hyperboreans of the speech of my right hon. friend? And what was the wind that got colder as the traveller went farther north? Was not the comparison this—that, as on the earth's surface the cold increases as we move in that direction, so in the downward figures of the franchise the voters become progressively more drunken, or more venal; or, to refrain from recalling those unhappy words, I would say simply more and more unfit? Now, sir, we too know something of those men; but what we know is very different from the supposed knowledge of my right hon. friend. The right hon. Gentleman asked, 'Do you think the franchise is good in itself, or do you wish to improve the institutions of the country?' Sir, I find here no dilemma. My answer to both questions is, emphatically, Aye! The extension of the franchise, within safe and proper limits, is good, in and of itself. It will array more persons in support of the institutions of the country; and that is another good. The composition and the working of this House is admirable, and its per-



formances have long since placed it at the head of all the legislative assemblies of the world. It does not follow, however, that it cannot be improved. I will not say, with my right hon. friend, that it is perfect. I am not sure, indeed, that he said so in terms; but he seemed to mean, if not to say it. I am not prepared to pay the worship of idolatry, even to this House. I will mention a point of far-reaching importance, in which I think it might be improved. It is this. I need not say I am scarcely speaking of the present House, which has but just entered upon its labours. I am speaking of the Reformed Parliament in general. There is a saying which has been ascribed to a very eminent person, still alive, whose name I will not mention, because I have no means of knowing whether it has been truly ascribed to him or not, but I will quote it for its own sake. It is to this effect, that the unreformed Parliament used, in the common phrase, to job for individuals, while the reformed Parliament jobs for classes. I do not adopt the rudeness of the expression; but the substance of the observation is, in my opinion, just. I think that the influence of separate classes is here too strong, and that the influence of the public interest, properly so called, as distinguished from the interests of sets, groups, and knots of men, is too weak. I fully admit I am not, perhaps, altogether an impartial judge. I speak much from my own experience, during a lengthened period, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and as in a special degree and sense the guardian of the public purse. Undoubtedly, if there be a weak point in the composition of the House, this is the department in which it would most readily and most clearly show itself. I believe it to be a weak point. I believe that the composition of the House might be greatly improved; and that the increased representation of the working classes would supply us more largely with that description of Members whom we want; of Members who would look, not to the interests of classes, but to the public interest. In presuming to say so much as this, I hope I do not convey any reproach to any party or person; but my right hon. friend (Mr. Lowe) challenged us so sharply, as if we admitted that no improvement whatever was possible, that I felt bound thus far to state in general terms my conviction.

•

Again, sir, I return to the broad proposition of my right hon. friend. He says we have no reasons. Perhaps he does not admit, as a reason, what was stated the other day by the hon. Member for Birmingham, that there have been a hundred meetings, public meetings, held in favour of this bill. I observed, when those words were spoken, that loud murmurs arose on the other side of the House at the mention of the number; and I have not the least doubt of their good faith. I, however, was persuaded that the hon. Member for Birmingham was right; and, turning to the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions, I counted the meetings. [An Opposition Member: 'Got up!'] The meetings are 'got up,' are they? Then you have your remedy. Go and get up meetings against the measure. It will then be seen, whether it is or is not an easy matter to obtain an expression of public sentiment like this, on which to found your operations. I know not whether they are 'got up' or not; if Gentlemen think they are, it is, as I have said, open to them who think so to try the experiment the other way. But this I know, that I counted roughly the petitions presented from public meetings, and signed individually by the chairmen of these meetings, and I found that between April 11 and 17 there were about 187 such petitions, besides five or six hundred thousand signatures from individuals in favour of this bill. So much then, sir, I say as respects that description of argument which may with fairness be drawn, within certain bounds, from the evident and expressed opinion of the country.

But now I have to grapple with the principal argument, if such it be, of my right hon. friend the Member for Calne, and to confront all the dismal pictures he draws of the destruction of the British Constitution. My answer is, that it is not going to be destroyed. We are not going to import American principles. It is not necessary to discuss them, either for blame or praise. It is not an American principle to reduce the borough franchise. It is a return to old English principles; it is a restoration of the state and course of things that subsisted before, and ought to subsist again. What has happened since 1832? I am now going to state a part of the case on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley):



The working people have been having a less and less share in the representation. They had a considerable representation before 1832, through the scot-and-lot voters and the freemen. I am not going to say anything either for or against the freemen ; but through them the working class had their voice in the representation. They are gradually dying out. (3 Hansard, clii. 1066.)

That was the emphatic statement of the right hon. Gentleman in 1859 ; and has it been counteracted since ? No ; it has not been counteracted, certainly not to any considerable extent, not even, as I believe, in the least degree. I will now state the growth of the numbers of electors in boroughs. And not generally since 1832, for when I stated what it had been from 1832 to 1865, I gave an unjust advantage to my opponents ; but since 1851. Now, I pray the House to observe these figures, which I am about to give. In 1851 the total number of the electors in boroughs was 410,000 ; in 1865-6 it was 509,000, showing an increase of 99,000 : that is to say, an increase of 24 per cent. in fourteen years. That, then, has been the increase in the number of the electors. I come next to the increase of population in boroughs. In the year 1851 it was 7,186,000 ; in 1866 it was by estimate 9,266,000, giving an increase of 2,079,000, or, in other words, of 28·9 per cent. in the population. That being so, I ask those Gentlemen who speak of the gradual absorption of the working classes into the constituencies, and of the franchise as being within their reach, to consider, to deal with these figures. We now see that we have actually a slower growth of the electors in boroughs than of the population. Well, but while the population and the electors have been moving on as I have described, the wealth of the country among the middle and upper classes has, according to the best estimate which I can make, been advancing as follows. The income-tax in 1851, making due allowance for the changes which have been since introduced into the law, may be taken, with sufficient approach to accuracy for the purpose of comparison, as having been worth not more than £850,000 per penny. This year I am enabled to state that it is worth £1,400,000 per penny. That is to say, there has been an increase of 65 per cent. in the wealth of the country liable to income-tax, or at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum. But when I remind you that this vast increase of the wealth

liable to income-tax has been an increase almost entirely in the upper and middle classes, and yet that the total number of electors in the towns does not even keep pace with the population, I hope we shall hear no more of this supposed absorption of the working classes into the enfranchised body. 5 In the figures before us, it is too plain that there is no room for any such absorption. I was justified, then, in stating that the working classes are not adequately represented in this House, even as compared with 1832. They are not, it is admitted, represented in any proportion to their numbers; 10 and, without holding that it would be fit for us to do more than lessen that disproportion, we contend it is right to do as much. They are not represented, as I have previously shown, in accordance with their share of the income of the country. Especially after the events of the last few years, 15 I may boldly proceed to say they are not represented in proportion to their intelligence, their virtue, or their loyalty. Finally, they are less represented now than they were thirty-six years ago, when they were admittedly less competent to exercise the franchise. A greater amount of representation, 20 with a less amount of fitness, was not found to be injurious, but wholesome, for the State; and now, when, as you admit, there is a greater amount of fitness, and, as you must grant, there is a less amount of representation, still you are not disposed, it seems, to accede to a further measure of enfranchise- 25 ment.

If these are not good reasons for extending the suffrage at the present time, I know not what reasons can be good. But, if hon. Members think they can hold their ground in a policy of resistance and refusal for the present, I have to ask 30 them, how do they regard the future? My right hon. friend the Member for Calne has prophesied to us, in the most emphatic terms, the ruin of the British Constitution. His prophecies were beautiful, as far as his masterly use of the English language is concerned. But many prophecies quite 35 as impressive may be found in the pages of Mr. Burke or of Mr. Canning, and other almost equally distinguished men. What has been the fate of those prophecies? What uses do they now serve? They form admirable material of declamations for school-boys; capital exercises to be trans- 40 lated into Greek. The prophecies of my right hon. friend,



like those of yet more famous men than he, may some thirty years hence serve a similar purpose. They may, for the beauty, force, and clearness of their language, be selected by teachers at colleges and schools as exercises for their  
 5 pupils; and my right hon. friend will have his reward, as others have had theirs: *Ut pueris placeas, et declamatio fias*. My right hon. friend says, does he? that we know nothing about the labouring classes. Is not one single word a sufficient reply? That word is Lancashire—Lancashire, asso-  
 10 ciated with the sufferings of the last four years, so painful and bitter in themselves to contemplate, but so nobly and gloriously borne. The qualities then exhibited were the qualities not of a few men here and there, select among a depraved multitude, but of the mass of a toiling community.  
 15 The sufferings were sufferings of the mass. The heroism was heroism of the mass. For my own part, I cannot believe that the men who exhibited those qualities were a false sample of the people of England, and that the rest would have wholly failed in exhibiting the same great qualities, had  
 20 occasion arisen. I cannot see what argument could be found for some wise and temperate experiment of the extension of civil rights among such people, if the experience of the past few years does not sufficiently afford it.

And now, sir, let us for a moment consider the enormous  
 25 and silent changes which have been going forward among the labouring population. May I use the words to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen once used by way of exhortation by Sir Robert Peel to his opponents? 'Elevate your vision.' Let us try and raise our view somewhat above  
 30 the fears, the suspicions, the jealousies, the reproaches, and the recriminations of this place and this occasion. Let us look onward to the time of our children, and of our children's children. Let us examine what preparation it behoves us should be made to meet that coming time. Is there, or  
 35 is there not, I ask, a steady movement discernible in the labouring class, and is or is not that movement a movement onwards, and a movement upwards? I will not say that it falls beneath the eye; for, like all great processes, it is unobservable in detail; but as solid and undeniable, as it  
 40 is resistless in its essential character. It is like those movements of the crust of the earth, which, science tells us, are

even now going on in certain portions of the globe. The sailor courses over these regions in his ship, and the traveller crosses them by land, without being conscious of such changes ; but from day to day, from hour to hour, the heaving forces are at work, and after a season we discern, from actual experience, that the levels are changed by elevation and depression, that things are not as they were. Has my right hon. friend, in whom mistrust rises to its utmost height, ever really considered the astonishing phenomena connected with some portion of the conduct of the labouring classes, especially in the Lancashire distress ? Has he considered what an amount of self-denial was exhibited by these men in respect to the American War ? They knew that the source of their distress, of their crushing distress, lay in that war ; yet they never uttered or entertained the wish that any effort should be made to put an end to it, as they held it, correctly or erroneously it matters not, to be a war for justice and for freedom. Could any man have believed that a conviction so still, so calm, so firm, so energetic, could have planted itself in the minds of a population without becoming a known patent fact throughout the whole country ? But we knew nothing of it. And yet, when the day of trial came, then we saw that noble sympathy on their part with the people of the North ; that determination that, be their sufferings what they might, no word should proceed from them that would hurt a cause which they so firmly believed to be just. On one side, then, there was a magnificent moral spectacle. On the other side was there not also a great lesson to us all, to teach us that in those little tutored, but yet most reflective minds, by a process of quiet instillation, opinions and sentiments gradually form themselves of which we for a long time remain unaware, but which, when at last they make their appearance, are found to be deep-rooted, mature, and ineradicable ?

And now, sir, I turn to another matter, and I ask my noble friend how he proposes to administer the government of that singularly associated family of persons who adopt his amendment ? There ought to be some unity of purpose among those friends and associates, who have linked themselves together on a question such as this ; among those who design to overturn Governments, or to destroy Reform Bills.



I will state a portion of the contradictions that are to be gathered out of this debate on one side only. My noble friend says we ought to have referred this question to the Committee of Privy Council. But the right hon. Member for 5 the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) tells him, and tells him truly, that it would be totally useless; firstly, it would do no good; and secondly, it would be entirely unconstitutional. That is the first specimen I give. Next, my right hon. friend (Mr. Walpole) says we ought to have in- 10 troduced a measure of redistribution; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud, and the hon. Member for Galway, say they would have been content, the one to support our Franchise Bill, and both of them to entertain and to discuss it, if only we had said nothing about redis- 15 tribution. Again, my hon. friend, the Member for Wick, says we ought to proceed with the two bills *pari passu*; but my right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University says, and supports his opinion with sound reasoning to show, that such a course of proceeding would only involve 20 increased delay. The right hon. Member for Calne, again, avows that such a course would remove none of his objections. The right hon. Member for Bucks, I think, says the same; and yet the hon. Member for Wick announces that, if only we will adopt his advice, he will answer for 25 our obtaining every vote on the Liberal side of the House. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast thinks that representation is founded on classes. My right hon. friend (Mr. Walpole) replies, 'No, it is not founded on classes, but on communities.' The hon. and learned Member for Belfast 30 says fitness is not a ground for enfranchisement; and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Herts proclaims, not merely that he would be satisfied, but, with emphatic and expressive gesture, that he would be delighted, if every artisan who is fit for the franchise could be admitted to it. 35 The noble Lord the Member for Galway (Lord Dunkellin) not only declares his adhesion to Reform, but states that it is in the capacity of an ardent Reformer that he objects to our measure; while the right hon. and gallant General the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) frames a catalogue of the mischiefs we have had to endure during the 40 reforming era, and pretty plainly considers that we have had

not only enough of Reform in Parliament, but even a little more than enough. The hon. Member for Cambridge holds, I think very truly, that Parliament is pledged in this matter. Not, of course, to do what it may think wrong—nobody ever said anything so absurd; but what is meant is this, 5 that those pledges of Parliament are pledges which, if they are not observed, will cause discredit to Parliament, and will tend to the disparagement of Parliamentary Government with the people of this country. But while my right hon. friend owns that Parliament is pledged, the hon. Mem- 10 ber for Dublin and the right hon. Member for Bucks have laboured to demonstrate that it is under no pledge whatever. Lastly, sir, the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire protests he is an ardent friend of Reform. I will not contradict him; that would not be agreeable to 15 good manners; neither will I even cite against him the words of any other Gentleman, but I will cite his own words and opinions. I conceive that in his judgement—a most untrue and injurious judgement, as I think—he has contradicted himself; because, while he has thus declared his 20 friendliness to Reform, he has also avowedly and pointedly, I might almost say ostentatiously, gloried in Lord Palmerston as being a man whose life, if it had only been prolonged, would have effectually kept at bay any new Reform Bill. That, sir, which I have represented in these references is 25 the state of self-contradiction among this party—a party gathered together for a chance purpose; with no bond of cohesion, with no declared principle, with no avowed intention; meaning, as I must repeat, one thing and saying another thing; saying that which is of comparatively small 30 account, and not saying, but suppressing, the thing which the most important persons engaged in the operation deeply feel, and which they would wish to say. Such is the state of things among our present opponents. Such is their harmony of language, their unity of view, upon this the 35 first and only occasion on which they have been able to co-operate.

Sir, the hour has arrived when this protracted debate must come to an end. [Cheers.] I cannot resent the warmth with which that last expression of mine has been re-echoed. 40 My apologies to the House are sincere. I feel deeply in-



debted, not to Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House only, but also and not less to hon. Gentlemen opposite, for the patience with which they have heard me. But a very few words more, and I have done. May I speak briefly  
5 to hon. Gentlemen on the other side, as some of them have copiously addressed advice to Gentlemen on this side of the House? I would ask them, will you not consider, before you embark in this new crusade, whether the results of those other political crusades, in which you have heretofore  
10 engaged, have been so satisfactory to you as to encourage you to a new venture in the same direction? Great battles you have fought; and fought them manfully. The battle of maintaining civil disabilities on account of religious belief; the battle of resistance to the first Reform Act; the obstinate  
15 and long-continued battle of Protection—all these great battles have been fought by the great party that I now look in the face; and, as to some limited portion of those conflicts, I admit my own share of the responsibility. But I ask again, have their results, have their results towards  
20 yourselves, been such as that you should be disposed to renew struggles similar to these? Certainly those who compose the Liberal Party in British politics have, at least in that capacity, no reason or title to find fault. The effect of your course has been to give over to your adversaries for  
25 five out of every six, or for six out of every seven years, since the epoch of the Reform Act, the conduct and management of public affairs. The effect has been to lower, to reduce, and contract your just influence in the country, and to abridge your legitimate share in the administration of  
30 the Government. It is good for the public interest that you also should be strong. But if you are to be strong, you can only be so by showing, in addition to the kindness and the personal generosity which I am sure you feel towards the people, a public, a political trust and confidence in the  
35 people. What I now say can hardly be said with an evil motive. I am conscious of no such sentiment towards any man or any party. But, sir, we are assailed, and with us the bill, of which we think more seriously than of ourselves. This bill is in a state of crisis and of peril, and the Government  
40 along with it. We stand or fall with it, as has been declared by my noble friend Lord Russell. We stand with it now;

we may fall with it a short time hence. If we do so fall, we, or others in our places, shall rise with it hereafter. I shall not attempt to measure with precision the forces that are to be arrayed against us in the coming issue. Perhaps the great division of to-night is not to be the last, but only the first of a series of divisions. At some point of the contest you may possibly succeed. You may drive us from our seats. You may slay, you may bury, the measure that we have introduced. But we will write upon its gravestone, for an epitaph, this line, with certain confidence in its fulfilment : 10

Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.

You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side. The great social forces which move onwards in their might and majesty, and which the tumult of these debates does not for a moment impede or disturb, those great social forces are against you ; they work with us ; they are marshalled in our support. And the banner which we now carry in the fight, though perhaps, at some moment of the struggle, it may droop over our sinking heads, yet will float again in the eye of heaven, and will be borne by the firm hands of the united people of the three kingdoms, perhaps not to an easy, but to a certain and to a not distant victory. 15 20

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 318 ; Noes 313 : Majority 5.

Main question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.



VI  
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE  
EDUCATION

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS AT ST. ANDREWS,  
MARCH 19, 1869

My first duty, in the observations which I am about to address to you, is to make my personal acknowledgements on the occasion which has brought me to this place. When we begin our work in this world, we value most the approbation of those older than ourselves. To be regarded favourably by those who have obtained distinction bids us hope that we too, by and by, may come to be distinguished in turn. As we advance in life, we learn the limits of our abilities. Our expectations for the future shrink to modest dimensions. 10 The question with us is no longer what we shall do, but what we have done. We call ourselves to account for the time and talents which we have used or misused, and then it is that the good opinion of those who are coming after us becomes so peculiarly agreeable. If we have been roughly 15 handled by our contemporaries, it flatters our self-conceit to have interested another generation. If we feel that we have before long to pass away, we can dream of a second future for ourselves in the thoughts of those who are about to take their turn upon the stage.

20 Therefore it is that no recognition of efforts of mine which I have ever received has given me so much pleasure as this movement of yours in electing me your Rector—an honour as spontaneously and generously bestowed by you as it was unlooked for, I may say undreamt of, by me.

25 Many years ago, when I was first studying the history of

the Reformation in Scotland, I read a story of a slave in a French galley who was one morning bending wearily over his oar. The day was breaking, and, rising out of the grey waters, a line of cliffs was visible, and the white houses of a town and a church tower. The rower was a man unused to such service, worn with toil and watching, and likely, it was thought, to die. A companion touched him, pointed to the shore, and asked him if he knew it.

'Yes,' he answered, 'I know it well. I see the steeple of that place where God opened my mouth in public to His glory; and I know, how weak soever I now appear, I shall not depart out of this life till my tongue glorify His name in the same place.'

Gentlemen, that town was St. Andrews, that galley-slave was John Knox; and we know that he came back and did 'glorify God' in this place and others to some purpose.

Well, if anybody had told me, when I was reading about this, that I also should one day come to St. Andrews and be called on to address the University, I should have listened with more absolute incredulity than Knox's comrade listened to that prophecy.

Yet, inconceivable as it would then have seemed, the unlikely has become fact. I am addressing the successors of that remote generation of students whom Knox, at the end of his life, 'called round him,' in the yard of this very College, 'and exhorted them,' as James Melville tells us, 'to know God and stand by the good cause, and use their time well.' It will be happy for me if I, too, can read a few words to you out of the same lesson-book; for, to make us know our duty and do it, to make us upright in act and true in thought and word, is the aim of all instruction which deserves the name, the epitome of all purposes for which education exists. Duty changes, truth expands, one age cannot teach another either the details of its obligations or the matter of its knowledge; but the principle of obligation is everlasting. The consciousness of duty, whatever its origin, is to the moral nature of man what *life* is in the seed-cells of all organised creatures: the condition of its coherence, the elementary force in virtue of which it grows.

Every one admits this in words. Rather, it has become a cant nowadays to make a parade of noble intentions. The



application is the difficulty. When we pass beyond the verbal propositions our guides fail us, and we are left in practice to grope our way or guess it as we can. So far as our special occupations go, there is no uncertainty. Are we traders, 5 mechanics, lawyers, doctors?—we know our work. Our duty is to do it as honestly and as well as we can. When we pass to our larger interests, to those which concern us as men—to what Knox meant by ‘knowing God and standing by the good cause’—I suppose there has been rarely a time 10 in the history of the world when intelligent people have held more opposite opinions. The Scots to whom Knox was speaking understood him well enough. They had their Bibles as the rule of their lives. They had broken down the tyranny of a contemptible superstition. They were growing 15 up into yeomen, farmers, artisans, traders, scholars, or ministers, each with the business of his life clearly marked out before him. Their duty was to walk uprightly by the light of the Ten Commandments, and to fight with soul and body against the high-born scoundreldom and spiritual sorcery 20 which were combining to make them again into slaves.

I will read you a description of the leaders of the great party in Scotland against whom the Protestants and Knox were contending. I am not going to quote any fierce old Calvinist who will be set down as a bigot and a liar. My 25 witness is M. Fontenay, brother of the secretary of Mary Stuart, who was residing here on Mary Stuart’s business. The persons of whom he was speaking were the so-called Catholic Lords, and the occasion was in a letter to herself:

‘The Sirens,’ wrote this M. Fontenay, ‘which bewitch the lords of this 30 country are money and power. If I preach to them of their duty to their Sovereign—if I talk to them of honour, of justice, of virtue, of the illustrious actions of their forefathers, and of the example which they should themselves bequeath to their posterity—they think me a fool. They can talk of these things themselves—talk as well as the 35 best philosophers in Europe. But, when it comes to action, they are like the Athenians, who knew what was good, but would not do it. The misfortune of Scotland is that the noble lords will not look beyond the points of their shoes. They care nothing for the future and less for the past.’

40 To free Scotland from the control of an unworthy aristocracy, to bid the dead virtues live again, and plant the

eternal rules in the consciences of the people—this, as I understand it, was what Knox was working at, and it was comparatively a simple thing. It was simple, because the difficulty was not to know what to do, but how to do it. It required no special discernment to see into the fitness for government of lords like those described by Fontenay; or to see the difference, as a rule of life, between the New Testament and a creed that issued in Jesuitism and the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The truth was plain as the sun. The thing then wanted was *courage*; courage in common men to 10 risk their skins, to venture the high probability that before the work was done they might have their throats cut, or see their houses burnt over their heads.

Times are changed; we are still surrounded by temptations, but they no longer appear in the shape of stake and 15 gallows. They come rather as intellectual perplexities on the largest and gravest questions which concern us as human creatures; perplexities with regard to which self-interest is perpetually tempting us to be false to our real convictions. The best that we can do for one another is to exchange our 20 thoughts freely; and that, after all, is but little. Experience is no more transferable in morals than in art. The drawing-master can direct his pupil generally in the principles of art. He can teach him here and there to avoid familiar stumbling-blocks. But the pupil must himself realise every rule which 25 the master gives him. He must spoil a hundred copy-books before the lesson will yield its meaning to him. Action is the real teacher. Instruction does but prevent waste of time or mistakes; and mistakes themselves are often the best teachers of all. In every accomplishment, every mastery of 30 truth, moral, spiritual, or mechanical—

Necesse est  
Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris:

our acquirements must grow into us in marvellous ways—marvellous—as anything connected with man has been, is, and 35 will be.

I have but the doubtful advantage, in speaking to you, of a few more years of life; and even whether years bring wisdom or do not bring it is far from certain. The fact of growing older teaches many of us to respect notions which 40



we once believed to be antiquated. Our intellectual joints stiffen, and our father's crutches have attractions for us. You must therefore take the remarks that I am going to make at what appears to you their intrinsic value. Stranger as  
5 I am to all of you, and in a relation with you which is only transient, I can but offer you some few general conclusions which have forced themselves on me during my own experience in the hope that you may find them not wholly useless. And, as it is desirable to give form to remarks which might other-  
10 wise be desultory, I will follow the train of thought suggested by our presence at this place and the purpose which brings you here. You stand on the margin of the great world, into which you are about to be plunged, to sink or swim. We will consider the stock-in-trade, the moral and mental furniture,  
15 with which you will start upon your journey.

In the first place, you are Scots ; you come of a fine stock, and much will be expected of you. If we except the Athenians and Jews, no people so few in number have scored so deep a mark in the world's history as you have done. No  
20 people have a juster right to be proud of their blood, and I doubt if the Scot ever breathed who would have sold his birthright for money. Well, then, *Noblesse oblige* ; all blood is noble here, and a noble life should go along with it. It is not for nothing that you here and we in England come, both  
25 of us, of our respective races ; we inherit honourable traditions and memories ; we inherit qualities inherent in our bone and blood, which have been earned for us, no thanks to ourselves, by twenty generations of ancestors ; our fortunes are now linked together for good and evil, never more to be  
30 divided ; but, when we examine our several contributions to the common stock, the account is more in your favour than ours.

More than once you saved English Protestantism ; you may have to save it again, for all that I know, at the rate at which  
35 our English parsons are now running. You gave us the Stuarts, but you helped us to get rid of them. Even now you are teaching us what, unless we saw it before our eyes, no Englishman would believe to be possible, that a Member of Parliament can be elected without bribery. For shrewdness of  
40 head, thoroughgoing completeness, contempt of compromise, and moral backbone, no set of people were ever started into

life more generously provided. You did not make these things; it takes many generations to breed high qualities either of mind or body; but you have them, they are a fine capital to commence business with, and, as I said, *Noblesse oblige*.

5  
So much for what you bring with you into the world. And the other part of your equipment is only second in importance to it: I mean your education. There is no occasion to tell a Scotchman to value education. On this, too, you have set us an example which we are beginning to 10 imitate: I only wish our prejudices and jealousies would let us imitate it thoroughly. In the form of your education, whether in the parish school or here at the University, there is little to be desired. It is fair all round to poor and rich alike. You have broken down, or you never per- 15 mitted to rise, the enormous barrier of expense which makes the highest education in England a privilege of the wealthy. The subject-matter is another thing. Whether the subjects to which, either with you or with us, the precious years of boyhood and youth continue to be given, are the best in 20 themselves, whether they should be altered or added to, and, if so, in what direction and to what extent, are questions which all the world is busy with. Education is on everybody's lips. Our own great schools and colleges are in the middle of a revolution, which, like most revolutions, means 25 discontent with what we have, and no clear idea of what we would have. You yourselves cannot here have wholly escaped the infection, or, if you have, you will not escape it long. The causes are not far to seek. On the one hand, there is the immense multiplication of the subjects of know- 30 ledge, through the progress of science, and the investigation on all sides into the present and past condition of this planet and its inhabitants; on the other, the equally increased range of occupations, among which the working part of mankind are now distributed, and for one or other of which our 35 education is intended to qualify us. It is admitted by every one that we cannot any longer confine ourselves to the learned languages, to the grammar and logic and philosophy which satisfied the seventeenth century. Yet, if we try to pile on the top of these the histories and literatures of our own and 40 other nations, with modern languages and sciences, we



accumulate a load of matter which the most ardent and industrious student cannot be expected to cope with.

It may seem presumptuous in a person like myself, unconnected as I have been for many years with any educational body, to obtrude my opinion on these things. Yet outsiders, it is said, sometimes see deeper into a game than those who are engaged in playing it.

In everything that we do, or mean to do, the first condition of success is that we understand clearly the result which we desire to produce. The house-builder does not gather together a mass of bricks and timber and mortar, and trust that somehow a house will shape itself out of its materials. Wheels, springs, screws, and dial-plate will not constitute a watch, unless they are shaped and fitted with the proper relations to one another. I have long thought that, to educate successfully, you should first ascertain clearly, with sharp and distinct outline, what you mean by an educated man.

Now our ancestors, whatever their other short-comings, understood what they meant perfectly well. In their primary education and in their higher education they knew what they wanted to produce, and they suited their means to their ends. They set out with the principle that every child born into the world should be taught his duty to God and man. The majority of people had to live, as they always must, by bodily labour; therefore, every boy was, as early as was convenient, set to labour. He was not permitted to idle about the streets or lanes. He was apprenticed to some honest industry. Either he was sent to a farm, or, if his wits were sharper, he was allotted to the village carpenter, bricklayer, tailor, shoemaker, or whatever it might be. He was instructed in some positive calling by which he could earn his bread and become a profitable member of the commonwealth. Besides this, but not, you will observe, independent of it, you had in Scotland, established by Knox, your parish schools where he was taught to read, and, if he showed special talent that way, he was made a scholar of and trained for the ministry. But neither Knox nor any one in those days thought of what we call enlarging the mind. A boy was taught reading that he might read his Bible and learn to fear God and be ashamed and afraid to do wrong.

An eminent American was once talking to me of the school

system in the United States. The boast and glory of it, in his mind, was that every citizen born had a fair and equal start in life. Every one of them knew that he had a chance of becoming President of the Republic, and was spurred to energy by the hope. Here, too, you see, is a distinct object. 5 Young Americans are all educated alike. The aim put before them is to get on. They are like runners in a race, set to push and shoulder for the best places; never to rest contented, but to struggle forward in never-ending competition. It has answered its purpose in a new and unsettled country, where 10 the centre of gravity has not yet determined into its place; but I cannot think that such a system as this can be permanent, or that human society, constituted on such a principle, will ultimately be found tolerable. For one thing, the prizes of life so looked at are at best but few and the com- 15 petitors many. 'For myself,' said the great Spinoza, 'I am certain that the good of human life cannot lie in the possession of things which, for one man to possess, is for the rest to lose, but rather in things which all can possess alike, and where one man's wealth promotes his neighbour's.' At 20 any rate, it was not any such notion as this which Knox had before him when he instituted your parish schools. We had no parish schools in England for centuries after he was gone, but the object was answered by the Church catechising and the Sunday-school. Our boys, like yours, were made to 25 understand that they would have to answer for the use that they made of their lives. And in both countries, by industrial training, they were put in the way of leading useful lives if they would be honest. The essential thing was, that every one that was willing to work should be enabled to maintain 30 himself and his family in honour and independence.

Pass to the education of a scholar, and you find the same principle otherwise applied. There are two ways of being independent. If you require much, you must produce much. If you produce little, you must require little. Those whose 35 studies added nothing to the material wealth of the world were taught to be content to be poor. They were a burden on others, and the burden was made as light as possible. The thirty thousand students who gathered out of Europe to Paris to listen to Abelard did not travel in carriages, and they 40 brought no portmanteaus with them. They carried their



wardrobes on their backs. They walked from Paris to Padua, from Padua to Salamanca, and they begged their way along the roads. The laws of mendicancy in all countries were suspended in favour of scholars wandering in pursuit of  
 5 knowledge. At home, at his college, the scholar's fare was the hardest, his lodging was the barest. If rich in mind, he was expected to be poor in body; and so deeply was this theory grafted into English feeling that earls and dukes, when they began to frequent Universities, shared the common  
 10 simplicity. The furniture of a noble earl's room at an English University at present may cost, including the pictures of opera-dancers and race-horses and such like, perhaps £500. When the magnificent Earl of Essex was sent to Cambridge in Elizabeth's time, his guardians provided him with a deal  
 15 table covered with green baize, a truckle-bed, half a dozen chairs, and a washhand-basin. The cost of all, I think, was five pounds.

You see what was meant. The scholar was held in high honour; but his contributions to the commonwealth were not  
 20 appreciable in money, and were not rewarded with money. He went without what he could not produce, that he might keep his independence and his self-respect unharmed. Neither scholarship nor science starved under this treatment; more noble souls have been smothered in luxury than were ever  
 25 killed by hunger. Your Knox was brought up in this way, Buchanan was brought up in this way, Luther was brought up in this way, and Tyndal, who translated the Bible, and Milton and Kepler and Spinoza, and your Robert Burns. Compare Burns, bred behind the plough, and our English  
 30 Byron!

This was the old education, which formed the character of the English and Scotch nations. It is dying away at both extremities, as no longer suited to what is called modern civilisation. The apprenticeship, as a system of instruction,  
 35 is gone. The discipline of poverty—not here as yet, I am happy to think, but in England—is gone also; and we have got instead what are called enlarged minds.

I ask a modern march-of-intellect man what education is for; and he tells me it is to make educated men. I ask  
 40 what an educated man is: he tells me it is a man whose intelligence has been cultivated, who knows something of

the world he lives in—the different races of men, their languages, their histories, and the books that they have written; and again, modern science, astronomy, geology, physiology, political economy, mathematics, mechanics—everything, in fact, which an educated man ought to know. 5

Education, according to this, means instruction in everything which human beings have done, thought, or discovered; all history, all languages, all sciences.

The demands which intelligent people imagine that they can make on the minds of students in this way are something 10 amazing. I will give you a curious illustration of it. When the competitive examination system was first set on foot, a board of examiners met to draw up their papers of questions. The scale of requirement had first to be settled. Among them a highly distinguished man, who was to examine in 15 English history, announced that, for himself, he meant to set a paper for which Macaulay might possibly get full marks; and he wished the rest of the examiners to imitate him in the other subjects. I saw the paper which he set. I could myself have answered two questions out of a dozen. And 20 it was gravely expected that ordinary young men of twenty-one, who were to be examined also in Greek and Latin, in moral philosophy, in ancient history, in mathematics, and in two modern languages, were to show a proficiency in each and all of these subjects, which a man of mature age and 25 extraordinary talents, who had devoted his whole time to that special study, had attained only in one of them.

Under this system teaching becomes cramming; an enormous accumulation of propositions of all sorts and kinds is thrust down the students' throats, to be poured out again, 30 I might say vomited out, into examiners' laps; and this, when it is notorious that the sole condition of making progress in any branch of art or knowledge is to leave on one side everything irrelevant to it, and to throw your undivided energy on the special thing you have in hand. 35

Our old Universities are struggling against these absurdities. Yet, when we look at the work which they on their side are doing, it is scarcely more satisfactory. A young man going to Oxford learns the same things which were taught there two centuries ago; but, unlike the old scholars, he learns 40 no lessons of poverty along with it. In his three years' course



he will have tasted luxuries unknown to him at home, and contracted habits of self-indulgence which make subsequent hardships unbearable : while his antiquated knowledge, such as it is, has fallen out of the market ; there is no demand for 5 him ; he is not sustained by the respect of the world, which finds him ignorant of everything in which it is interested. He is called educated ; yet, if circumstances throw him on his own resources, he cannot earn a sixpence for himself. An Oxford education fits a man extremely well for the trade 10 of gentleman. I do not know for what other trade it does fit him as at present constituted. More than one man who has taken high honours there, who has learnt faithfully all that the University undertakes to teach him, has been seen in these late years breaking stones upon a road in Australia. 15 That was all which he was found to be fit for when brought in contact with the primary realities of things.

It has become necessary to alter all this ; but how and in what direction ? If I go into modern model schools, I find first of all the three R's, about which we are all agreed ; I find 20 next the old Latin and Greek, which the schools must keep to while the Universities confine their honours to these ; and then, by way of keeping up with the times, ' abridgements,' ' text-books ' ' elements,' or whatever they are called, of a mixed multitude of matters : history, natural history, physio- 25 logy, chronology, geology, political economy, and I know not what besides ; general knowledge which, in my experience, means general ignorance : stuff arranged admirably for one purpose, and one purpose only—to make a show in examinations. To cram a lad's mind with infinite names 30 of things which he never handled, places he never saw or will see, statements of facts which he cannot possibly understand, and must remain merely words to him—this, in my opinion, is like loading his stomach with marbles ; for bread, giving him a stone. It is wonderful what a quantity of things of 35 this kind a quick boy will commit to memory, how smartly he will answer questions, how he will show off in school inspections, and delight the heart of his master. But what has been gained for the boy himself, let him carry this kind of thing as far as he will, if, when he leaves school, he has to 40 make his own living ? Lord Brougham once said he hoped a time would come when every man in England would read

Bacon. William Cobbett, that you may have heard of, said he would be contented if a time came when every man in England would eat bacon. People talk about enlarging the mind. Some years ago I attended a lecture on education in the Free Trade Hall at Manchester. Seven or eight thousand 5 people were present, and among the speakers was one of the most popular orators of the day. He talked in the usual way of the neglect of past generations, the benighted peasant, in whose besotted brain even thought was extinct, and whose sole spiritual instruction was the dull and dubious parson's sermon. 10 Then came the contrasted picture: the broad river of modern discovery flowing through town and hamlet, science shining as an intellectual sun, and knowledge and justice, as her handmaids, redressing the wrongs and healing the miseries of mankind. Then, wrapt with inspired frenzy, the musical 15 voice thrilling with transcendent emotion—"I seem," the orator said, "I seem to hear again the echo of that voice which rolled over the primeval chaos, saying, "Let there be light.""

As you may see a breeze of wind pass over standing corn, and every stalk bends, and a long wave sweeps across the 20 field, so all that listening multitude swayed and wavered under the words. Yet, in plain prose, what did this gentleman definitely mean? First and foremost, a man has to earn his living, and all the 'ologies will not of themselves enable him to earn it. Light! yes, we do want light, but it 25 must be light which will help us to work and find food and clothes and lodging for ourselves. A modern school will undoubtedly sharpen the wits of a clever boy. He will go out into the world with the knowledge that there are a great many good things in it which it will be highly pleasant to 30 get hold of; able as yet to do no one thing for which anybody will pay him, yet bent on pushing himself forward into the pleasant places somehow. Some intelligent people think that this is a promising state of mind, that an ardent desire to better our position is the most powerful incentive that we 35 can feel to energy and industry. A great political economist has defended the existence of a luxuriously-living idle class as supplying a motive for exertion to those who are less highly favoured. They are like Olympian gods, condescending to show themselves in their Empyrean, and to say to their 40 worshippers, 'Make money, money enough, and you and



your descendants shall become as we are, and shoot grouse and drink champagne all the days of your lives.'

No doubt this would be a highly influential incitement to activity of a sort ; only, it must be remembered that there  
 5 are many sorts of activity, and short, smooth cuts to wealth as well as long, hilly roads. In civilised and artificial communities there are many ways, where fools have money and rogues want it, of effecting a change of possession. The process is at once an intellectual pleasure, extremely rapid,  
 10 and every way more agreeable than dull mechanical labour. I doubt very much indeed whether the honesty of the country has been improved by the substitution so generally of mental education for industrial ; and the three R's, if no industrial training has gone along with them, are apt, as Miss Nightin-  
 15 gale observes, to produce a fourth R of rascaldom.

But it is only fair, if I quarrel alike with those who go forward and those who stand still, to offer an opinion of my own. If I call other people's systems absurd, in justice I must give them a system of my own to retort upon. Well,  
 20 then, to recur once more to my question. Before we begin to build, let us have a plan of the house that we would construct. Before we begin to train a boy's mind, I will try to explain what I, for my part, would desire to see done with it.

25 I will take the lowest scale first.

I accept without qualification the first principle of our forefathers, that every boy born into the world should be put in the way of maintaining himself in honest independence. No education which does not make this its first aim is worth  
 30 anything at all. There are but three ways of living, as some one has said : by working, by begging, or by stealing. Those who do not work, disguise it in whatever pretty language we please, are doing one of the other two. A poor man's child is brought here with no will of his own. We have no  
 35 right to condemn him to be a mendicant or a rogue ; he may fairly demand therefore to be put in the way of earning his bread by labour. The practical necessities must take precedence of the intellectual. A tree must be rooted in the soil before it can bear flowers and fruit. A man must learn  
 40 to stand upright upon his own feet, to respect himself, to be independent of charity or accident. It is on this basis only

that any superstructure of intellectual cultivation worth having can possibly be built. The old apprenticeship therefore, was, in my opinion, an excellent system, as the world used to be. The Ten Commandments and a handicraft made a good and wholesome equipment to commence life with. 5 Times are changed. The apprentice plan broke down: partly because it was abused for purposes of tyranny; partly because employers did not care to be burdened with boys whose labour was unprofitable; partly because it opened no road for exceptional clever lads to rise into higher positions; so 10 they were started in a groove from which they could never afterwards escape.

Yet the original necessities remain unchanged. The Ten Commandments are as obligatory as ever, and practical ability, the being able to do something, and not merely to 15 answer questions, must still be the backbone of the education of every boy who has to earn his bread by manual labour.

Add knowledge afterwards as much as you will, but let it be knowledge which will lead to the doing better each particular work which a boy is practising, and every fraction of 20 it will thus be useful to him; and if he has it in him to rise, there is no fear but he will find opportunity. The poet Coleridge once said that every man might have two versions of his Bible: one the book that he read, the other the trade that he pursued; he could find perpetual illustrations of every 25 Bible truth in the thoughts which his occupation might open to him.

I would say, less fancifully, that every honest occupation to which a man sets his hand would raise him into a philosopher if he mastered all the knowledge that belonged to his 30 craft.

Every occupation, even the meanest—I don't say the scavenger's or the chimney-sweep's—but every productive occupation which adds anything to the capital of mankind, if followed assiduously with a desire to understand everything 35 connected with it, is an ascending stair whose summit is nowhere, and from the successive steps of which the horizon of knowledge perpetually enlarges. Take the lowest and most unskilled labour of all, that of the peasant in the field. The peasant's business is to make the earth grow food; the 40 elementary rules of his art are the simplest, and the rude



practice of it the easiest ; yet between the worst agriculture and the best lies agricultural chemistry, the application of machinery, the laws of the economy of force, and the most curious problems of physiology. Each step of knowledge  
5 gained in these things can be immediately applied and realised. Each point of the science which the labourer masters will make him not only a wiser man but a better workman ; and will either lift him, if he is ambitious, to a higher position, or make him more intelligent and more valuable if he remains  
10 where he is. If he be one of Lord Brougham's geniuses, he need not go to the *Novum Organon* ; there is no direction in which his own subject will not lead him, if he cares to follow it, to the furthest boundary of thought. Only I insist on this, that information shall go along with practice, and the  
15 man's work become more profitable while he himself becomes wiser. He may then go far, or he may stop short ; but, whichever he do, what he has gained will be real gain, and become part and parcel of himself.

It sounds like mockery to talk thus of the possible prospects  
20 of the toil-worn drudge who drags his limbs at the day's end to his straw pallet, sleeps heavily, and wakes only to renew the weary round. I am but comparing two systems of education, from each of which the expected results may be equally extravagant. I mean only that if there is to be this  
25 voice rolling over chaos again, ushering in a millennium, the way of it lies through industrial teaching, where the practical underlies the intellectual. The millions must ever be condemned to toil with their hands, or the race will cease to exist. The beneficent light, when it comes, will be a light which will  
30 make labour more productive by being more scientific ; which will make the humblest drudgery not unworthy of a human being, by making it at the same time an exercise to his mind.

I spoke of the field-labourer. I might have gone through the catalogue of manual craftsmen : blacksmiths, carpenters,  
35 bricklayers, tailors, cobblers, fishermen, what you will. The same rule applies to them all. Detached facts on miscellaneous subjects, as they are taught at a modern school, are like separate letters of endless alphabets. You may load the mechanical memory with them till it becomes a marvel of  
40 retentiveness. Your young prodigy may amaze examiners, and delight inspectors. His achievements may be em-

blazoned in blue-books, and furnish matter for flattering reports on the excellence of our educational system ; and all this while you have been feeding him with chips of granite. But arrange your letters into words, and each becomes a thought, a symbol waking in the mind an image of a real 5 thing. Group your words into sentences, and thought is married to thought and produces other thoughts, and the chips of granite become soft bread, wholesome, nutritious, and invigorating. Teach your boys subjects which they can only remember mechanically, and you teach them nothing 10 which it is worth their while to know. Teach them facts and principles which they can apply and use in the work of their lives ; and if the object be to give your clever working lads a chance of rising to become Presidents of the United States, or millionaires with palaces and powdered footmen, the 15 ascent into those blessed conditions will be easier and healthier, along the track of an instructed industry, than by the paths which the most keenly sharpened wits would be apt to choose for themselves.

To pass to the next scale, which more properly concerns us 20 here. As the world requires handicrafts, so it requires those whose work is with the brain, or with the brain and hand combined—doctors, lawyers, engineers, ministers of religion. Bodies become deranged, affairs become deranged, sick souls require their sores to be attended to ; and so arise the learned 25 professions, to one or other of which I presume that most of you whom I am addressing intend to belong. Well, to the education for the professions I would apply the same principle. The student should learn at the University what will enable him to earn his living as soon after he leaves it as possible. 30 I am well aware that a professional education cannot be completed at a University ; but it is true also that with every profession there is a theoretic or scientific groundwork which can be learnt nowhere so well, and, if those precious years are wasted on what is useless, will never be learnt 35 properly at all. You are going to be a lawyer : you must learn Latin, for you cannot understand the laws of Scotland without it ; but if you must learn another language, Norman-French will be more useful to you than Greek, and the Acts of Parliament of Scotland more important reading than Livy 40 or Thucydides. Are you to be a doctor ?—you must learn



Latin too ; but neither Thucydides nor the Acts of Parliament will be of use to you—you must learn chemistry ; and if you intend hereafter to keep on a level with your science, you must learn modern French and German, and learn them  
5 thoroughly well, for mistakes in your work are dangerous.

Are you to be an engineer ? You must work now, when you have time, at mathematics. You will make no progress without it. You must work at chemistry ; it is the grammar of all physical sciences, and there is hardly one of the physical  
10 sciences with which you may not require to be acquainted. The world is wide, and Great Britain is a small, crowded island. You may wait long for employment here. Your skill will be welcomed abroad ; therefore now also, while you have time, learn French, or Russian, or Chinese, or Turkish. The com-  
15 mand of any one of these languages will secure to an English or Scotch engineer instant and unbounded occupation.

The principle that I advocate is of earth, earthy. I am quite aware of it. We are ourselves made of earth ; our work is on the earth, and most of us are commonplace people,  
20 who are obliged to make the most of our time. History, poetry, logic, moral philosophy, classical literature, are excellent as ornament. If you care for such things, they may be the amusement of your leisure hereafter ; but they will not help you to stand on your feet and walk alone ; and  
25 no one is properly a man till he can do that. You cannot learn everything ; the objects of knowledge have multiplied beyond the powers of the strongest mind to keep pace with them all. You must choose among them, and the only reasonable guide to choice in such matters is utility. The  
30 old saying, *Non multa sed multum*, becomes every day more pressingly true. If we mean to thrive, we must take one line and rigidly and sternly confine our energies to it. Am I told that it will make men into machines ? I answer that no men are machines who are doing good work conscientiously  
35 and honestly, with the fear of their Maker before them. And if a doctor or a lawyer has it in him to become a *great* man, he can ascend through his profession to any height to which his talents are equal. All that is open to the handicraftsman is open to him, only that he starts a great many rounds higher  
40 up the ladder.

What I deplore in our present higher education is the

devotion of so much effort and so many precious years to subjects which have no practical bearing upon life. We had a theory at Oxford that our system, however defective in many ways, yet developed in us some especially precious human qualities. Classics and philosophy are called there *literæ humaniores*. They are supposed to have an effect on character, and to be specially adapted for creating ministers of religion. The training of clergymen is, if anything, the special object of Oxford teaching. All arrangements are made with a view to it. The heads of colleges, the resident fellows, tutors, 10 professors, are, with rare exceptions, ecclesiastics themselves.

Well, then, if they have hold of the right idea, the effect ought to have been considerable. We have had thirty years of unexampled clerical activity among us: churches have been doubled; theological books, magazines, reviews, news- 15 papers have been poured out by the hundreds of thousands; while by the side of it there has sprung up an equally astonishing development of moral dishonesty. From the great houses in the City of London to the village grocer, the commercial life of England has been saturated with fraud. So 20 deep has it gone that a strictly honest tradesman can hardly hold his ground against competition. You can no longer trust that any article that you buy is the thing which it pretends to be. We have false weights, false measures, cheating and shoddy everywhere. Yet the clergy have seen all 25 this grow up in absolute indifference; and the great question which at this moment is agitating the Church of England is the colour of the ecclesiastical petticoats.

Many a hundred sermons have I heard in England, many a dissertation on the mysteries of the faith, on the divine 30 mission of the clergy, on apostolical succession, on bishops, and justification, and the theory of good works, and verbal inspiration, and the efficacy of the sacraments; but never, during these thirty wonderful years, never one that I can recollect on common honesty, or those primitive command- 35 ments, Thou shalt not lie, and Thou shalt not steal.

The late Bishop Blomfield used to tell a story of his having been once late in life at the University Church at Cambridge, and of having seen a verger there whom he remembered when he was himself an undergraduate. The Bishop said he was 40 glad to see him looking so well at such a great age. 'Oh, yes,



my lord,' the fellow said, 'I have much to be grateful for. I have heard every sermon which has been preached in this church for fifty years, and, thank God, I am a Christian still.'

Classical philosophy, classical history and literature, taking, 5 as they do, no hold upon the living hearts and imagination of men in this modern age, leave their working intelligence a prey to wild imaginations, and make them incapable of really understanding the world in which they live. If the clergy knew as much of the history of England and Scotland as they 10 know about Greece and Rome, if they had been ever taught to open their eyes and see what is actually round them instead of groping among books to find what men did or thought at Alexandria or Constantinople fifteen hundred years ago, they would grapple more effectively with the moral pestilence 15 which is poisoning all the air.

But it was not this that I came here to speak of. What I insist upon is, generally, that in a country like ours, where each child that is born among us finds every acre of land appropriated, a universal 'Not yours' set upon the rich 20 things with which he is surrounded, and a government which, unlike those of old Greece or modern China, does not permit superfluous babies to be strangled—such a child, I say, since he is required to live, has a right to demand such teaching as shall enable him to live with honesty, and take such a 25 place in society as belongs to the faculties which he has brought with him. It is a right which was recognised in one shape or another by our ancestors. It must be recognised now and always, if we are not to become a mutinous rabble. And it ought to be the guiding principle of all education, high 30 and low. We have not to look any longer to this island only. There is an abiding-place now for Englishmen and Scots wherever our flag is flying. This narrow Britain, once our only home, has become the breeding-place and nursery of a race which is spreading over the world. Year after year 35 we are swarming as the bees swarm; and year after year, and I hope more and more, high-minded young men of all ranks will prefer free air and free elbow-room for mind and body to the stool and desk of the dingy office, the ill-paid drudgery of the crowded ranks of the professions, or the 40 hopeless labour of our home farmsteads and workshops.

Education always should contemplate this larger sphere,

and cultivate the capacities which will command success there. Britain may have yet a future before it grander than its past ; instead of a country standing alone, complete in itself, it may become the metropolis of an enormous and coherent empire : but on this condition only, that her children, when they leave her shores, shall look back upon her, not—like the poor Irish 5 when they fly to America—as a stepmother who gave them stones for bread, but as a mother to whose care and nurture they shall owe their after prosperity. Whether this shall be so, whether England has reached its highest point of greatness, and will now descend to a second place among the 10 nations, or whether it has yet before it another era of brighter glory, depends on ourselves, and depends more than anything on the breeding which we give to our children. The boy that is kindly nurtured, and wisely taught and assisted to 15 make his way in life, does not forget his father and his mother. He is proud of his family, and jealous for the honour of the name he bears. If the million lads that swarm in our towns and villages are so trained that at home or in the colonies they can provide for themselves, without passing first through 20 a painful interval of suffering, they will be loyal wherever they may be ; good citizens at home, and still Englishmen and Scots on the Canadian lakes or in New Zealand. Our island shores will be stretched till they cover half the globe. It was not so that we colonised America, and we are reaping 25 now the reward of our carelessness. We sent America our convicts. We sent America our Pilgrim Fathers, flinging them out as worse than felons. We said to the Irish cottier, You are a burden upon the rates ; go find a home elsewhere. Had we offered him a home in the enormous territories that 30 belong to us, we might have sent him to places where he would have been no burden but a blessing. But we bade him carelessly go where he would, and shift as he could for himself ; he went with a sense of burning wrong, and he left a root of bitterness behind him. Injustice and heedlessness have 35 borne their proper fruits. We have raised up against us a mighty empire to be the rival, it may be the successful rival, of our power.

Loyalty, love of kindred, love of country, we know not what we are doing when we trifle with feelings the most 40 precious and beautiful that belong to us—most beautiful,



most enduring, most hard to be obliterated—yet feelings which, when they are obliterated, cannot change to neutrality and cold friendship. Americans still, in spite of themselves, speak of England as home. They tell us they must be our  
5 brothers or our enemies, and which of the two they will ultimately be is still uncertain.

I beg your pardon for this digression ; but there are subjects on which we feel sometimes compelled to speak in season and out of it.

10 To go back.

I shall be asked whether, after all, this earning our living, this getting on in the world, are not low objects for human beings to set before themselves. Is not spirit more than matter ? Is there no such thing as pure intellectual culture ?  
15 'Philosophy,' says Novalis, 'will bake no bread, but it gives us our souls ; it gives us Heaven ; it gives us knowledge of those grand truths which concern us as immortal beings.' Was it not said, 'Take no thought what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed ? Your  
20 Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. Behold the lilies of the field, they toil not, neither do they spin. Yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.' Is this a dream ? No, indeed ! But such high counsels as these are addressed only to few ; and perhaps  
25 fewer still have heart to follow them. If you choose the counsels of perfection, count the cost, and understand what they mean. I knew a student once from whose tongue dropped the sublimest of sentiments ; who was never weary of discoursing on beauty and truth and lofty motives ; who  
30 seemed to be longing for some gulf to jump into, like the Roman Curtius—some 'fine opening for a young man' into which to plunge and devote himself for the benefit of mankind. Yet he was running all the while into debt, squandering the money on idle luxuries which his father was sparing  
35 out of a narrow income to give him a college education ; dreaming of martyrdom, and unable to sacrifice a single pleasure !

Consider to whom the words which I quoted were spoken ; not to all the disciples, but to the Apostles who were about  
40 to wander over the world as missionaries.

High above all occupations which have their beginning

and end in the seventy years of mortal life, stand undoubtedly the unproductive callings which belong to spiritual culture. Only, let not those who say we will devote ourselves to truth, to wisdom, to science, to art, expect to be rewarded with the wages of the other professions. 5

University education in England was devoted to spiritual culture, and assumed its present character in consequence; but, as I told you before, it taught originally the accompanying necessary lesson of poverty. The ancient scholar lived, during his course, upon alms—alms either from living patrons, 10 or founders and benefactors. But the scale of his allowance provided for no indulgences; either he learnt something besides his Latin, or he learnt to endure hardship. And if a University persists in teaching nothing but what it calls the humanities, it is bound to insist also on rough clothing, 15 hard beds, and common food. For myself, I admire that ancient rule of the Jews that every man, no matter of what grade or calling, shall learn some handicraft; that the man of intellect, while, like St. Paul, he is teaching the world, yet, like St. Paul, may be burdensome to no one. A man was 20 not considered entitled to live if he could not keep himself from starving. Surely those University men who had taken honours, breaking stones on an Australian road, were sorry spectacles; and still more sorry and disgraceful is the outcry coming by every mail from our colonies: 'Send us no more 25 of what you call educated men; send us smiths, masons, carpenters, day labourers; all of those will thrive, will earn their eight, ten, or twelve shillings a day; but your educated man is a log on our hands; he loafs in uselessness till his means are spent, he then turns billiard-marker, enlists as a 30 soldier, or starves.' It hurts no intellect to be able to make a door or hammer a horse-shoe; and if you can do either of these, you have nothing to fear from fortune. 'I will work with my hands, and keep my brain for myself,' said some one proudly, when it was proposed to him that he should 35 make a profession of literature. Spinoza, the most powerful intellectual worker that Europe has produced during the last two centuries, waving aside the pensions and legacies that were thrust upon him, chose to maintain himself by grinding object-glasses for microscopes and telescopes. 40

If a son of mine told me that he wished to devote himself



to intellectual pursuits, I would act as I should act if he wished to make an imprudent marriage. I would absolutely prohibit him for a time, till the firmness of his purpose had been tried. If he stood the test, and showed real talent, I  
5 would insist that he should in some way make himself independent of the profits of intellectual work for subsistence. Scholars and philosophers were originally clergymen. Nowadays a great many people whose tendencies lie in the clerical direction yet for various reasons shrink from the obligations  
10 which the office imposes. They take, therefore, to literature, and attempt and expect to make a profession of it.

Now, without taking a transcendental view of the matter, literature happens to be the only occupation in which the wages are not in proportion to the goodness of the work done.  
15 It is not that they are generally small, but the adjustment of them is awry. It is true that, in all callings, nothing great will be produced if the first object be what you can make by them. To do what you do well should be the first thing, the wages the second ; but, except in the instances of which I am  
20 speaking, the rewards of a man are in proportion to his skill and industry. The best carpenter receives the highest pay. The better he works, the better for his prospects. The best lawyer, the best doctor, commands most practice and makes the largest fortune. But, with literature, a different element  
25 is introduced into the problem. The present rule on which authors are paid is by the page and the sheet ; the more words the more pay. It ought to be exactly the reverse. Great poetry, great philosophy, great scientific discovery,  
✓ every intellectual production which has genius, work, and  
30 permanence in it, is the fruit of long thought and patient and painful elaboration. Work of this kind, done hastily, would be better not done at all. When completed, it will be small in bulk ; it will address itself for a long time to the few and not to the many. The reward for it will not be measurable,  
35 and not obtainable in money except after many generations, when the brain out of which it was spun has long returned to its dust. Only by accident is a work of genius immediately popular, in the sense of being widely bought. No collected edition of Shakespeare's plays was demanded in Shakespeare's  
40 life. Milton received five pounds for *Paradise Lost*. The distilled essence of the thought of Bishop Butler, the greatest

prelate that the English Church ever produced, fills a moderate sized octavo volume ; Spinoza's works, including his surviving letters, fill but three ; and, though they have revolutionised the philosophy of Europe, have no attractions for the multitude. A really great man has to create the taste with which he is to be enjoyed. There are splendid exceptions of merit eagerly recognised and early rewarded—our honoured English Laureate for instance, Alfred Tennyson, or your own countryman Thomas Carlyle. Yet even Tennyson waited through ten years of depreciation before poems which are now on every one's lips passed into a second edition. Carlyle, whose transcendent powers were welcomed in their infancy by Goethe, who long years ago was recognised by statesmen and thinkers in both hemispheres as the most remarkable of living men ; yet, if success be measured by what has been paid him for his services, stands far below your Belgravian novelist. A hundred years hence, perhaps, people at large will begin to understand how vast a man has been among them.

If you make literature a trade to live by, you will be tempted always to take your talents to the most profitable market ; and the most profitable market will be no assurance to you that you are making a noble or even a worthy use of them. Better a thousand times, if your object is to advance your position in life, that you should choose some other calling of which making money is a legitimate aim, and where your success will vary as the goodness of your work ; better for yourselves, for your consciences, for your own souls, as we used to say, and for the world you live in.

Therefore, I say, if any of you choose this mode of spending your existence, choose it deliberately, with a full knowledge of what you are doing. Reconcile yourselves to the condition of the old scholars. Make up your minds to be poor ; care only for what is true and right and good. On those conditions you may add something real to the intellectual stock of mankind, and mankind in return may perhaps give you bread enough to live upon, though bread extremely thinly spread with butter.

I have detained you long, but I cannot close without a few more general words. We live in times of change—political change, intellectual change, change of all kinds. You whose minds are active, especially such of you as give yourselves much to speculation, will be drawn inevitably into profoundly



interesting yet perplexing questions, of which our fathers and grandfathers knew nothing. Practical men engaged in business take formulas for granted. They cannot be for ever running to first principles. They hate to see established opinions disturbed. Opinions, however, will and must be disturbed from time to time. There is no help for it. The minds of ardent and clever students are particularly apt to move fast in these directions; and thus, when they go out into the world, they find themselves exposed to one of two temptations, according to their temperament: either to lend themselves to what is popular and plausible, to conceal their real convictions, to take up with what we call in England humbug, to humbug others, or, perhaps, to keep matters still smoother, to humbug themselves; or else to quarrel violently with things which they imagine to be passing away, and which they consider should be quick in doing it, as having no basis in truth. A young man of ability nowadays is extremely likely to be tempted into one or other of these lines. The first is the more common on my side of the Tweed; the harsher and more thoroughgoing, perhaps, on yours. Things are changing, and have to change, but they change very slowly. The established authorities are in possession of the field, and are naturally desirous to keep it. And there is no kind of service which they more eagerly reward than the support of clever fellows who have dipped over the edge of latitudinarianism, who profess to have sounded the disturbing currents of the intellectual seas, and discovered that they are accidental or unimportant.

On the other hand, men who cannot away with this kind of thing are likely to be exasperated into unwise demonstrativeness, to become radicals in politics and radicals in thought. Their private disapprobation bursts into open enmity; and this road too, if they continue long upon it, leads to no healthy conclusions. No one can thrive upon denials: positive truth of some kind is essential as food both for mind and character. Depend upon it that in all long-established practices or spiritual formulas there has been some living truth; and if you have not discovered and learnt to respect it, you do not yet understand the questions which you are in a hurry to solve. And again, intellectually impatient people should remember the rules of social courtesy,

which forbid us in private to say things, however true, which can give pain to others. These rules forbid us equally in public to obtrude opinions which offend those who do not share them. Our thoughts and our conduct are our own. We may say justly to any one, ' You shall not make me profess 5 to think true what I believe to be false ; you shall not make me do what I do not think just ' : but there our natural liberty ends. Others have as good a right to their opinion as we have to ours. To any one who holds what are called advanced views on serious subjects, I recommend a patient reticence 10 and the reflection that, after all, he may possibly be wrong. Whether we are Radicals or Conservatives, we require to be often reminded that truth or falsehood, justice and injustice, are no creatures of our own belief. We cannot make true things false, or false things true, by choosing to think them so. 15 We cannot vote right into wrong or wrong into right. The eternal truths and rights of things exist, fortunately, independent of our thoughts or wishes, fixed as mathematics, inherent in the nature of man and the world. They are no more to be trifled with than gravitation. If we discover 20 and obey them, it is well with us ; but that is all we can do. You can no more make a social regulation work well which is not just than you can make water run uphill.

I tell you, therefore, who take up with plausibilities, not to trust your weight too far upon them, and not to condemn 25 others for having misgivings which at the bottom of your own minds, if you look so deep, you will find that you share yourselves with them. You, who believe that you have hold of newer and wider truths, show it, as you may and must show it, unless you are misled by your own dreams, in leading wider, 30 simpler, and nobler lives. Assert your own freedom if you will, but assert it modestly and quietly ; respecting others as you wish to be respected yourselves. Only and especially I would say this : be honest with yourselves, whatever the temptation ; say nothing to others that you do not think, 35 and play no tricks with your own minds.

Of all the evil spirits abroad at this hour in the world *humbug* is the most dangerous.

This above all : to your own selves be true,  
And it will follow, as the night the day,  
You cannot then be false to any man.





## NOTES

### I

#### LITERARY COPYRIGHT

PAGE 47. *heading.* *Order of the Day* : the Order of the Day is the agenda of business in the House of Commons for each day. Government measures have the first right to the attention of the House. Private members' bills are chosen by ballot for consideration.

1. *sir* : a member must always address the Speaker of the House of Commons, or the Chairman of Committee. In the House of Lords a speaker addresses, not the Lord Chancellor, who presides, but his fellow-members.

7. *Serjeant* : a Serjeant-at-Law was a member of the highest order of barristers. The order, which existed certainly in the fourteenth century, had its own Inn of Court, the Serjeants' Inn. Serjeants were created under the royal seal, and a certain number were created King's or Queen's Serjeants, with a seat in Parliament. The order had a monopoly of certain legal practice (which was taken away from it in 1845 by Act of Parliament) and is now extinct.

8. *Talfourd* : Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd (1795-1854) was a distinguished lawyer, who rose to be Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in 1849. He was also the author of several tragedies (one of which, *Ion*, was a great success when acted by Macready in 1836), an essayist, a critic, and the friend and biographer of Charles Lamb. He published several volumes of *Memoirs* of Lamb from 1837 to 1850. He was elected M.P. for Reading in 1835. The first of his annual Copyright Bills was rejected in 1837, and his devotion to the interests of authors was recognised by Dickens, who dedicated *Pickwick Papers* to him. His measure was remodelled by Stanhope and Macaulay and passed in 1842.

9. *parental instinct* : several bills had been brought forward by Talfourd, one every year since 1837.

PAGE 48. 2. *act of attainder* : a bill of Attainder is an Act of Parliament aimed at an individual, and carrying, if passed, the punishment of death and forfeiture of property. The individual may appear in person or by counsel in Parliament to defend himself. The consent of Crown, Lords, and Commons is necessary to such an Act, as to all Acts. The last Act of Attainder was passed upon Sir John Fenwick in 1697. It is to be distinguished from an impeachment, which is



judicial in form and not legislative, the House of Lords being the Court.

4. *copy* : note this use of *copy*. Copyright is the right to copy. It is also the right of an author to his *copy*, the word being used technically among writers to mean manuscript.

8. *compromise* : Talfourd's Bill provided a compromise between the absolute unlimited right of an author to his copyright, and an expedient limitation of his right.

9. *But I must say* : sarcasm is a favourite weapon of all controversialists, especially of Macaulay.

15. *Paley* : Macaulay makes his point, nevertheless, and further proceeds to discuss it on a practical footing. William Paley (1743-1805), in his book, long popular as a text-book and authority, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, developed with great clearness of reasoning a system of theological utilitarianism. He finds the law of the land, however, insufficient, judging that it needs the law of God to supplement it. His *Evidences of Christianity* has always been popular as a summary of the external proofs of the Christian religion.

20. *I should still deny* : this was the main point at issue. Talfourd and Stanhope proposed to protect the copyright of a book for the author's life-time and sixty years after. The common law, it is to be noted, admitted, until 1709, the perpetual copyright of an author.

22. *the most mystical* : the school of Rousseau, for example, as opposed to the utilitarian school of Bentham or Paley, of which utilitarian school Macaulay was a worthy disciple.

29. *modes of succession* : after the Norman Conquest there was considerable confusion in the laws of the country. In respect of succession the Norman law prevailed as a rule, but certain old English customs survived in particular districts. (a) The Norman law provided for the succession of the eldest son to all property. This was the law of *primogeniture*. (b) In Kent the custom of *gavelkind* provided for the equal division of property among all sons. (c) In some parts the custom had grown up by which the youngest son succeeded, and this was no doubt due to the migration and establishment of the elder sons elsewhere. In the borough of Nottingham there was the curious example of one half of the town following this old English custom, and the other half following the new Norman rule of primogeniture, wherefore the former was called *borough English*.

Formerly, as provided by Magna Charta, a man might dispose of his whole personal property unconditionally only if he had no wife or children. The part secured to his wife or children was called the *pars rationabilis*, or proportionate part, and might be sued for. Certain localities of the city of London and the provinces of York and Wales maintained this rule until 1693, and the *custom of York* and the *custom of London* refer to this survival. The Statute of Distributions, passed in the reign of Charles II, provided for the distribution of the property of a man dying intestate among his wife, children, or other heirs, and excluded the custom of York, London, and Wales from its operation.

The Wills Act of 1837, to which Macaulay refers here in connection with witnesses, together with later Acts of the nineteenth century, forms the basis of modern law upon this point.



PAGE 49. 1. *jure divino* : by divine right. Are wills valid by divine right or by virtue of the signature of witnesses? Are witnesses appointed by divine right or by the necessities of the law?

14. *the existing law* : the law of 1814, which ensured copyright for the author's life or for twenty-eight years.

PAGE 50. 3. *You cannot depend* : this is a rather long digression of a platitudinous sort.

22. *One of those ways* : this was a matter of immediate interest, for the eighteenth century—the age of literary patronage—had only recently ended. It is to be noted that the patronage of the rich or powerful ensured the continuance of literature at times when there was yet no sufficient reading public to support men of letters by the sale of their books. It therefore served a useful purpose.

27. *Mæcenas and Pollio* : Mæcenas (65?–8 B.C.) was the confidential minister of the Roman Emperor Augustus, and has always been a proverbial example of a liberal patron of literature, especially as the patron of Vergil and Horace. Pollio (76? B.C.–A.D. 4?) was a distinguished orator, soldier, statesman, author, and critic, celebrated by Vergil in his 4th and 8th *Eclogues*.

*the Medici* : a family of statesmen and patrons of art who dominated Tuscany during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Cosimo de' Medici (1389–1464), the patron of the Revival of Learning in Italy, and Lorenzo de' Medici (1449–1492), the patron of Michelangelo, and a poet himself, were the most notable of the family.

28. *Louis the Fourteenth* (1638–1715), reigned in France from 1643 to 1715. During his reign not only the political power of France became paramount in Europe, but also her literary influence, due to the rise of a brilliant group of men of letters round the Court of Versailles, including Molière, Corneille, Racine, Bossuet, and Boileau, the leaders of the French Classical School.

*Halifax and Oxford* : the eighteenth century in England, unlike the Elizabethan Age, did not depend mainly upon popular favour for literary success. The works and lives of Dryden, Pope, Swift, Addison, and Johnson show the influence of their dependence upon great men and of political motives. Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax (1661–1715), was both poet and statesman, and his verses opened the way for his future power, for his rise to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer in 1694, and his elevation to the peerage in 1700. Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford (1661–1724), was a notable Tory statesman, whom Queen Anne raised to the peerage. He was also the generous patron of Pope and Swift, a lover of literature, and a book-collector, the founder of the famous Harleian Library.

33. *I can conceive* : whatever Macaulay argues, he argues by hyperbole as a rule. Neither Dryden nor Addison nor Vergil could ever have 'become the scandal and pest of nature.'

PAGE 51. 15. *if the real effect* : he attributes a similar hyperbole to Talfourd, who merely denied that copyright would result in dearth of books.

24. *the East India Company* : this Company, which was at first a purely trading venture, was granted a charter in 1600 to trade to the East Indies. As no other company received a licence or charter



of this sort, the Company had a monopoly, which was renewed in 1629 by James I 'for ever.' From small beginnings in India the Company built up not only a vast trade, but also a territorial empire. It absorbed in 1708 a formidable rival company, and from this time until 1858 the history of the Company is the history of India. In 1784 the political power of the Company passed to Parliament under the provisions of Pitt's India Bill, which constituted a Board of Control. In 1834 the monopoly of trade was taken from the Company, in 1853 the Civil Service was thrown open to competition, and after the Mutiny, in 1858, the entire administration of India was taken over by the Crown, and in 1876 Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India. The Company ceased to exist in 1873.

25. *those old monopolies*: monopolies, granting the exclusive right to trade in and sell a specific commodity, at first were intended to serve useful purposes. They were sold to the highest bidder in order to raise revenue, or were granted in order to encourage capitalists to engage in commerce and industry with a sure profit. Later, in Elizabeth's reign and in the reign of James I, monopolies were granted as rewards to court favourites, were extended to necessary commodities, such as salt, steel, coal, or leather, and became a serious economic menace. In 1597 Parliament was driven to petition the Queen, who promised to examine the question, but did nothing. In 1601 a serious agitation in London and in Parliament took place. Elizabeth, as always, knew when to yield, and gave way gracefully, pleading ignorance of the evil, in a famous speech to the House of Commons. She promised to abolish monopolies altogether, but as usual only partly kept her promise.

The evil grew to scandalous proportions later, and was again taken up by Parliament in the reign of James I. In 1624 monopolies were declared, by Act of Parliament, with certain exceptions, to be illegal.

Monopolies must obviously raise prices artificially. Starch, for example, which could be imported in 1601 for 18s. per cwt., was sold for 56s. Even in 1700 the average price of tea was 16s. per lb.

35. *any distinction*: you might as well argue that any one should have the right to pillage Essex's vineyards or the East India Company's tea-plantations! Monopoly is opposed to the principles of fair competition in trade, but copyright is by no means opposed to any principle of competition among authors. With no copyright law it merely becomes a question of competition among publishers.

The only true analogy is between authors and their copyright, and inventors and their patents.

39. *Essex*: Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (1566-1601), was a brilliant young soldier and courtier who replaced his step-father, Leicester, as favourite of Elizabeth. He was made Knight of the Garter and Lord Deputy of Ireland. Being sent to Ireland to put down the Ulster rebellion in 1599, he returned without leave and was imprisoned. He tried to raise a revolt in London and was executed in 1601.

He received the monopoly of sweet wines in 1590, as a mark of the Queen's favour, and it was partly owing to her refusal to renew it in 1601 that he was driven to desperate measures.

PAGE 52. 15. *But it is*: it is not a question of pleasure; it is a question of property and provision for families, as poor Walter Scott found.

The whole of this argument is practically a *reductio ad absurdum* of the question, and is mainly supported by false analogy and misinterpretation. It is a mere nullity. Authors themselves do not, and did not then, think so!

34. *Prince Esterhazy*: an Austrian nobleman with large landed property.

41. *Dr. Johnson*: Samuel Johnson, LL.D. (1709-1784), was the Dictator of English literary society in the later eighteenth century. He was a man of notable personal force rather than a great writer. Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, which gives a wonderful picture of the man Johnson, is a greater work than Johnson's own *Lives of the Poets* (1779-1781), his poem *London* (1738), written in imitation of the Latin satires of Juvenal, his allegorical romance *Rasselas* (1759), his laborious and interesting *Dictionary* (1755), or his edition of Shakespeare (1765).

PAGE 53. 7. *Black Frank*: this was the negro, Francis Barber, who was born in Jamaica, was brought to England in 1750, and served Dr. Johnson for thirty years. Johnson left most of his property to Barber in his will.

10. *Would it*: the answer to all these rhetorical questions is simple. It certainly would, if he had arranged for a *royalty*, as most authors do now, i.e. a fixed percentage on all copies sold. So that the difference (see below) between a copyright of twenty years and a copyright of sixty years is very considerable, and is especially great in the case of authors whose fame comes slowly, and who are generally the greatest. Not all authors are as fortunate as Macaulay, but have to be content with a low original price, and trust to royalties in the future.

17. *Gentleman's Magazine*: a miscellany founded in 1731 by Edward Cave. Johnson began to write for it in 1738, a year after his arrival in London. It was not permissible to report the debates of Parliament, but the imaginary *Debates of the Senate of Lilliput* were a transparent disguise which evaded the law, and were founded on the real speeches of Pitt and others in Parliament. For several years they were written by Johnson for Cave.

33. *not worth a farthing*: even apart from royalties, the value was not negligible, for surely a publisher would pay more for a book if he knew it was to be his exclusive property for a longer period.

34. *the principle of copyright*: this definition is clever, but not just. A publisher pays, not for a manuscript, but for the exclusive right to sell copies of it for a certain period. The law of copyright, therefore, forms a basis for a contract between author and publisher, and recognises and defines a certain class of property which, like all property, it is the duty of the law to protect. It is no more a tax than is the law which punishes theft.

The whole of the next five paragraphs is invalidated by this false idea, and by the principle of royalties. Macaulay's argument is very perverse.



PAGE 54. 19. *But I think it very hard*: very much the same argument is put forward by the friends of labour and enemies of capital to-day, with the same fallacy.

26. *Blenheim*: the palace of Blenheim, named after Marlborough's victory over the French in 1704, was presented by the nation to him and his heirs.

27. *Strathfieldsaye*: a mansion and estate in Hampshire bought from the Pitt family by Parliament in 1817 and presented to the Duke of Wellington and his heirs.

PAGE 55. 3. *Such is the inconstancy*: the general effect of this argument, if followed, would be to deny to publishers the possible profit from speculations, and consequently to lower the general scale of payment to authors. Altogether, Macaulay does not realise the necessity of publishing enterprise in the literary world. And he lived in the days of great publishers to whom we owe many debts.

11. *Cowley*: Abraham Cowley (1618-1667), a poet and essayist, whose elaborate and artificial odes enjoyed much fame during his life-time, as well as, to a less extent, his sacred epic  *Davideis* . His reputation diminished very rapidly, as the influence of his master, Donne, waned.

15. *Lord Bolingbroke* (1678-1751) was a Tory politician, and minister for a time to James the Pretender, in France. His works, chiefly political, were of transient popularity, though he enjoyed the admiration of Pope.

18. *Paternoster Row*: the street in London famous as a centre of the publishing trade.

*Hayley*: William Hayley (1745-1820) was one of the last and worst of those poets at the end of the eighteenth century who wrote in heroic couplets, as popular then, and as bad a poet, as Erasmus Darwin. His chief work, the *Triumphs of Temper*, was published in 1781. It is more to his credit that he was the friend of Cowper and Blake.

24. *the tax*: Macaulay defines copyright first as literary property, then as a monopoly, and finally as a tax. There is an extraordinary confusion and looseness of thought in his whole argument.

30. *Milton's granddaughter*: Mrs. Elizabeth Foster, who died in 1754, was the daughter of Milton's daughter, Mrs. Deborah Clarke. Both received the charity of literary society. A performance of *Comus*, a masque by Milton, was organised by David Garrick, the famous actor, for the benefit of Mrs. Foster. Dr. Johnson wrote a Prologue for the occasion, and the performance took place at Drury Lane Theatre, on April 5, 1750. The sum of £130 was thereby raised.

PAGE 56. 7. *The monopoly lasted . . . for ever*: common law, until 1709, when specific legislation on this subject began, regarded literary property as perpetual.

12. *Tonson*: Jacob Tonson (1656?-1736), the first of the modern type of publishers, after small beginnings, became Dryden's publisher and gained fame and fortune. It was due to publishers like Tonson that the system of patronage came to an end, for authors now could sell their works for a fair price. In 1683 Tonson bought one half of the rights in *Paradise Lost* from Aylmer, and in 1690 the other

half, at a considerable price. He retired in 1720, and the business was carried on by his nephew, Jacob Tonson the Second, and after 1735 by his great-nephew Jacob Tonson the Third (*d.* 1767), to whom Macaulay here refers.

The amount originally paid by the first purchaser of the copyright, Samuel Simmons, was £18.

13. *an injunction*: it is strange that such an injunction should have been granted. Tonson, it is true, had inherited the perpetual copyright, according to the common law then prevalent. But in 1709 the first Copyright Act provided for the protection of existing copyrights only for twenty-one years, after 1710. Therefore the copyright lapsed in 1731. Trade custom, however, seems to have persisted, and may have influenced the Court of Equity. In 1769 a similar test-case was decided in favour of the purchaser of the copyright, but another in 1774 ended in the 'pirates' favour.

31. *an exorbitant price*: publishers themselves will naturally try to increase their profits by trying to tap all markets, and cheap editions are as great a source of profit as expensive editions with a limited sale. So Tonson followed up his elaborate folio edition of 1687 by cheaper and smaller editions.

PAGE 57. 1. *the safeguards*: see below, note on p. 58, 17.

5. *Fielding*: Henry Fielding (1707-1754) was a dramatist, journalist, and novelist who, after a chequered career as a man of letters, became a hard-working magistrate in London. He died at Lisbon, seeking health on a sea-voyage. His greatest novels, *Tom Jones*, *Amelia*, and *Joseph Andrews*, definitely established the form of the English novel and its supremacy. Fielding has all the wide sympathy with human nature, and the frankness, of Shakespeare, describing men and women as they are, hating cant and concealment and false virtue. Therefore *Tom Jones*, the epic of an impulsive, frank, generous young man, offends prudish, conventional minds.

6. *Gibbon*: Edward Gibbon (1737-1794), after Westminster, Oxford, and five years in Switzerland, was led to the profession of an historian. On a visit to Rome, in 1764, he conceived the idea of his great work, and in 1776 the first volume of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* appeared. In 1788 volumes 5 and 6 completed the work. From 1783 to 1793 he lived at Lausanne, and thereafter returned to England. The excellence of the *Decline and Fall* was immediately recognised, and Gibbon is perhaps the greatest of English historians, by virtue of his complete view of a vast subject of unrivalled interest and of the lucidity and stateliness of his style. The pervading irony of Gibbon's mind was especially evident in his treatment of Christianity, and it is this aspect of the book which repels many readers and might cause in some a desire to suppress it.

13. *Richardson*: Samuel Richardson (1689-1761) was a prosperous printer whose novels, in the form of letters, brought him fame and extraordinary popularity both in England and abroad. He began writing at the age of fifty-two, and lived in a circle of admirers, mostly women, until his death. *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and *Sir Charles Grandison* are emotional novels of psychological analysis with remarkable sentimental force, and with an explicit moral lesson. Richard-



son's morality, however, is painfully conventional and utilitarian. His novels aroused exceptional enthusiasm in France and Germany. Especially in Diderot and Rousseau, and through Rousseau on Goethe, is the influence of Richardson's moralising sentimentality and pathos evident.

23. *Johnson* : in Johnson's periodical, the *Rambler*, and in the issue of February 19, 1751, an article by Richardson will be found, with a prefatory note by Johnson as follows : 'The reader is indebted for this day's entertainment to an author from whom the age has received greater favours, who has enlarged the knowledge of human nature, and taught the passions to move at the command of virtue.'

Johnson has also, however, put it on record that Richardson bored him seriously, and might be expected to bore others.

25. *Wilberforce* : William Wilberforce (1759-1833) was a friend of Pitt, the supporter in Parliament of his measures for Parliamentary Reform, and the pioneer of the movement for the abolition of slavery. He was a notable and attractive orator, and a man of high ideals and great piety.

In 1797 he published a work in which he contrasts the life of the upper classes in England with their professions of religion, entitled, *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians contrasted with Real Christianity*. In this book he asserts that Christianity has had no influence upon writers of fiction, and in a footnote adds, 'No exceptions have fallen within my own reading, but the writings of Richardson' (p. 243, 18th ed., 1830).

30. *Hannah More* (1745-1833), in her early days in London, was a charming and precocious young woman, who later on became a poetess and the chief of the 'blue-stockings,' a circle of learned, witty, or literary women. Subsequently she became known as the author of certain tragedies (*Percy, The Fatal Falsehood*), and finally as a reforming philanthropist, who initiated the method of propaganda by means of tracts.

Johnson, by the way, reproved her for reading *Tom Jones*, and recommended Richardson's novels to her.

I have not found the 'published poem' referred to here, not even in a 'complete' edition of her *Works*.

PAGE 58. 13. *what protection* : these are the 'safeguards' mentioned above, p. 57. 1.

17. *London Gazette* : probably the oldest, and for long the only, English newspaper. It dates, with interruptions up to 1665, from 1642. It is the official journal of the Government.

21. *What is a new edition?* Surely this might have been defined when the bill came into Committee. It is to be noted that the bill of 1910 provided similar safeguards to those of Talfourd. See Introduction.

31. *an Aldus or a Caxton* : Aldus Manutius Romanus (1450-1515) was a printer who opened the most famous press of the Renaissance at Venice in 1494. His editions, known as Aldine editions, of the great Greek and Latin classics, are among the priceless treasures of book-collectors.

William Caxton (1422?-1491), the first and most famous of English

printers, began to print books in English at Bruges in 1474, and from 1476 onwards in London. These books are now, of course, extremely rare and valuable.

33. *Boswell*: James Boswell (1740–1795) of whom an extremely unfair but clever account is given in Macaulay's famous biography of Johnson, was a Scotch lawyer who turned man of letters and came to London. He wrote much verse and a prose *Account of Corsica* (1768). He met Johnson in 1763, and became a member of the famous Literary Club in 1773. The fruit of his long worship of the great man, and his long intimacy with him, was that wonderful book, his *Life of Johnson*, in the pages of which Johnson lives again for all readers. It was published in 1791.

Boswell's father and his son both complained that his hero-worship led him into positions of undignified inferiority not worthy of his ancient and proud family. And Boswell does not spare himself in his book.

PAGE 59. 6. *Camden*: William Camden (1551–1623) was a scholar, topographer, chronicler, and head master of Westminster School after 1592, one of his pupils being Ben Jonson. He journeyed through England in 1582, and wrote a description which was published in Latin in 1586 and in English in 1610. Macaulay probably refers to this work, Camden's *Britannia*, and to this English edition by Philemon Holland. His *Annals* of the reign of Elizabeth were first published in English in 1625.

8. *the finest prose work of fiction*: I fear Macaulay means *Clarissa*, not *Tom Jones*, and few will agree with his opinion. He alleged, by the way, that he could write the whole novel down from memory. This, if credible, is stupefying!

19. *John Wesley* (1703–1791) was a clergyman of the Church of England who, together with his brother Charles, sought to reform the Church from within, but ended in establishing the Wesleyan Methodist sect of Nonconformists, a sect which soon became powerful and numerous in England and America.

20. *his works*: Wesley's chief works were his *Journal*, containing a diary of his activities from 1735 to 1790, his published *Sermons*, and his *Notes on the New Testament* and other theological works, in which he taught the doctrine of justification by faith.

22. *some person or other*: observe that Macaulay, at one moment, bases his argument on the assumption that literary copyright must always be in the hands of publishers. He now abandons this view, somewhat inconsistently.

26. *Methodists*: it is to be noted that this was one of the many nicknames applied in derision to Wesley and his friends at Oxford.

37. *hymns*: John Wesley's hymns are chiefly translations, while Charles Wesley (1707–1788) is famous as a hymn-writer. He wrote some 6,500 hymns. John arranged and selected the collections used by the Wesleyans.

38. *imprimatur*: this word means licence to print (*lit.* 'let it be printed'). In former days, when the permission of the civil or ecclesiastical authority was necessary to the printer, it was given by means of this formula.



PAGE 60. 2. *Ecclesiastical Courts*: the wide powers once possessed by the Church as a judicial authority separate from the civil authority, have gradually diminished until to-day it deals with matters of church discipline almost exclusively.

3. *Established Church*: the Church of England, or Anglican Church, is recognised by the State officially as the principal religious body in England. Its ministers take part in state functions, such as the coronation of a king, and some of its bishops sit in the House of Lords.

4. *Christian burial*: he refused to conduct the funeral ceremony at the burial of the child according to the rites of the Church, and insisted that it should be buried in unconsecrated ground. He would not consider the child to be a Christian unless it had been baptized by a priest of the Church, believing that no other could validly perform the ceremony, which indicates admission to the Church of Christ.

5. *a work*: This may have been the periodical, the *British Critic*, which was the organ of the tractarian movement in the Church of England, better known as the Oxford Movement. The future Cardinal Newman was editor of this periodical at the time of Macaulay's speech. The tractarians were the party of authority and tradition, and were obviously opposed to Methodism.

8. *forsworn priest*: Wesley was originally a priest in the Church of England.

12. *Book of Common Prayer*: this is the Liturgy of the Church of England, collected and arranged for universal use. It contains the orders for morning and evening prayer, and for Holy Communion, also the Psalms and selections from the Bible, and forms of prayer for special ceremonies. Various forms of the book have appeared, from the first fragments of Cranmer in 1544 to the final authorised form, approved by Parliament in 1662.

25. *absurd Acts*: all rights to take or sell game were formerly restricted by a property qualification, irrespective of ownership, until 1832. It is notable, however, that the penalties for poaching were increased in 1828. It is necessary to distinguish these laws from the bloodthirsty Forest Laws, which subsisted until the end of the eighteenth century.

Smuggling was a notable feature of the eighteenth century in England, both on account of customs and excise duties. The excise duty of 20s. a gallon on spirits in 1746, for example, gave a great impetus to the trade in smuggled liquor. The gradual decrease in customs duties which is the outcome of the free-trade policy has made smuggling no longer profitable.

It is rather amazing to find a Whig supporting the enemies of the laws of Parliament. His prophecy, by the way, has hardly come to pass, though copyright is practically as long as Talfourd wished it to be.

35. *Pass this law*: could a difference of a few years of copyright make such a difference in public opinion, which is notoriously difficult to move? The small interest taken even by educated men in the question was shown by the thin House in which Macaulay was actually speaking! It was a very different question from the other two, one

of which touched on a national sport, and the other upon a national bad habit !

PAGE 61. 1. *Robinson Crusoe* : the delightful romance of Daniel Defoe (1661 ?-1731) written in 1719, the grave realism of which attracts young and old equally.

2. *the Pilgrim's Progress* : an allegory of the spiritual life of man represented as a journey through many dangers, written by John Bunyan (1628-1688) and published in 1678. It appeals to all readers by its profound religious inspiration or by its narrative and dramatic power and its quaint humour. Like *Robinson Crusoe*, it is a national literary possession.

4. *a hundred years* : to be precise, seventy-two and seventy years respectively. Further, Defoe, in 1719, was living in comparative affluence, nor was Bunyan in especial need of money in 1678. Nor would it be to the advantage of the bookseller's grandson to restrict the sale by making the price so high, for ten thousand shillings indubitably equal five hundred sovereigns.

15. *those restraints* : pirates pirate despite public opinion, even as smugglers smuggle, as long as it is profitable and moderately safe.

23. *this day six months* : this is the most frequent formula for the rejection of a bill. Until the bill is read a second time it cannot be proceeded with. To postpone the reading of the Bill for six months means that it cannot be dealt with in the current session, which would then be at an end. Other methods of opposition, the previous question, and an amendment which destroys the principle of the bill, are less frequent. The former of these two permits the bill to be brought forward again during the same session.

## II

### NATIONAL REPRESENTATION

PAGE 62. 1. *Mr. Hume* : Joseph Hume (1777-1855) made a fortune in India between 1800 and 1807, entered Parliament in 1812, and sat for Montrose from 1842 until his death. He went over from Toryism to Radicalism, and became one of the chiefs of the Reformers, to whose programme he added the plea for retrenchment. He was incessantly active in Parliament, kept a staff of clerks to compile statistics for him, and was a poor speaker.

3. *discontent* : he is referring to the Chartist agitation, which broke out afresh in 1848. This motion proposes some of the demands formulated in the People's Charter.

10. *Henry Drummond* (1786-1860) entered Parliament in 1810 and represented West Surrey from 1847 to 1860. He was a wealthy Tory, non-party, and refreshingly independent. He was one of the founders of the Irvingite church, in which he held the rank of apostle, evangelist, and prophet.

*Lord John Russell* : see note on p. 128, 9.

11. *Mr. W. J. Fox* : William Johnson Fox (1786-1864) was a man of somewhat varied activities: a clergyman, man of letters (editor of the *Monthly Repository*), politician, philanthropist, reformer, and



popular orator. He represented Oldham from 1847 to 1863 as a working-class member.

*the Motion* : The motion was counted out at 2 a.m.

16. *serfs* : Mr. Fox in his speech, which immediately preceded Disraeli's, asked whether the working classes were to be 'treated as only members of a *slave* class,' and whether Parliament could turn and say to them, 'We tell you that you are the *villeins* of the soil.' Mr. Hume also argued that 'taxation and representation should go together, and those who did not assist in the election of members . . . were not in the condition which distinguished freemen from *slaves*.'

26. *£10 elector* : the £10 household franchise was the general basis of the Reform Bill of 1832.

27. *poets sleeping under hedges* : Disraeli refers to Fox's plea that there were men of original genius in the working classes. 'The poet Thom,' he said, 'of Inverurie, who took shelter under a hedge and saw his child die there, and who could give his country songs worthy of Burns, that man never knew what it was to live in a £10 house.'

PAGE 63. 7. *a project* : Fox argued in favour of universal suffrage, Hume of household suffrage merely.

13. *this side of the House* : i.e. to the left of the Speaker, the side of the House occupied by the Opposition. Supporters of the Government sit to the right of the Speaker.

16. *the Reform Act* : the Act of 1832. See Introduction, p. 13.

33. *difficulties* : to oppose a measure of reform would place the Tory party in the position of seeming to be the enemies of the people.

PAGE 64. 8. *the meetings* : the ground for this motion was prepared by frequent popular meetings, which passed resolutions and prepared petitions in favour of reform.

16. *petitions* : one of them was presented by Mr. Bright, 'from an immense number of places, in favour of an extension of the elective franchise'; another by Mr. Hume, 'from the Committee of the West London Anti-Enclosure Association, for Retrenchment of the Expenditure.'

29. *statistics* : Fox gave statistics regarding the circulation of newspapers (70,000,000, he said), Mechanics' Institutes, magazines and popular literature, the sales of cheap books, the number of visitors to the British Museum, parks, and Savings Banks, to indicate the spread of general intelligence.

33. *railway intellect* : a frequent sarcasm of the day (e.g. in Peacock's novels), aimed at the hasty and superficial intellectual development of the industrial classes.

PAGE 66. 8. *general fund* : the annual wealth of the country.

12. *upstairs* : the documents are in the Library upstairs in the House. A more frequent parliamentary phrase is, 'They have been laid on the table.'

24. *return* : a parliamentary statement, furnished by the officers of the Government, for the information of members and of the country.

25. *Customs*: taxes on imported articles, first levied in 1225 on wool.

28. *Excise*: taxes levied on goods manufactured and consumed within the country, the tax on liquors in 1643 being the first.

30. *Stamps*: taxes on legal documents and publications, first levied in 1712 upon the periodical press.

31. *Post Office*: Penny Postage was introduced in 1839.

34. *redistribution of taxation*: obviously these four kinds of taxes are borne partly by the working classes, and a larger proportion of the total revenue must have been raised from Income-tax and other taxes affecting only the upper classes. The tax on imported corn, in particular, was removed in 1846.

PAGE 67. 12. *ad nauseam*: with sickening reiteration.

14. *the character*: their reputation for honesty or reliability.

PAGE 68. 1. *the militia*: the law entailing universal liability to render military service on attaining the age of eighteen has never been abrogated in England, as both Hume and Disraeli pointed out. The later custom was to choose a certain number by ballot for service in the militia, each detachment from each county being under the command of the Lord-Lieutenant of the county, and being called out for training or service when required. The militia was last called out in 1830. It was chiefly of use as a recruiting-ground for the Regular Army. Reorganised on a voluntary basis in 1852, it came under the Crown wholly in 1871, and was made part of the Regular Forces in 1881. In 1908 it was abolished as militia, and became the Army Special Reserve, being replaced as a voluntary force by the Territorial Forces.

5. *legal age*: the age at which the law recognises the individual as responsible, namely, twenty-one years.

13. *posse comitatus*: literally 'the power of a county.' From the earliest days the sheriff of a county had power to call out all citizens over the age of fifteen to render service in case of riot or other need. The police preserve order nowadays, of course. Cf. the phrase a *posse* of police.

18. *in another place*: this is the usual parliamentary phrase for the House of Lords. Disraeli, however, refers here to the French Chamber.

27. *a lady of the manor*: a manor was originally an estate feudally organised, self-contained, with its own law-court, sometimes with power of life and death. These legal powers gradually lapsed with the growth of the royal judiciary system.

29. *churchwarden*: a churchwarden is a lay governor of the endowments and affairs of a church and parish, in consultation with the rector. An overseer of the poor is an administrator of the Poor Laws in a given parish, distributing relief where necessary.

34. *disfranchises millions*: Hume's household suffrage excludes many of the working classes whose cause Fox urged.

39. *created by law*: cf. Macaulay's argument touching Copyright. This argument illuminates the whole course of the history of the English Constitution.



PAGE 69. 7. *that order* : the Commons, as a body of electors.

22. *got pelted* : popular agitation accompanied the course of the Reform Bill of 1831-1832, and riots of a serious nature ensued upon its rejection in the first place by the Tory majority in the House of Lords.

30. *the bill . . . the whole bill*, etc. : a popular cry at the time of the Reform Bill.

PAGE 70. 2. *the Whig party* : in office both in 1832 and in 1848. Its leader, Lord John Russell—as well as Disraeli, the leader of the Tory Opposition—spoke against this motion.

33. *Member for Surrey* : Henry Drummond ; see note on p. 62, 10.

35. *the only qualification* : Disraeli's bill of 1859 attempted to introduce 'fancy franchises,' with complete failure.

PAGE 71. 34. *the ancient past* : ancient Greece and Rome both practised voting by secret ballot. In the United States it was adopted in various States from 1775 onwards, and the imperfection of the system led to bribery and intimidation. In England the first motion advocating the ballot was passed by the Commons in 1710, but it was not instituted until 1872.

PAGE 72. 14. *before the American war* : Disraeli refers to the American Revolution, not to the war of 1812-1814. 'Roberts, who was Secretary of the Treasury under Pelham until 1754 . . . regularly paid secret stipends varying from £500 to £800 to a number of members at the end of each session.' Disraeli, however, exaggerates the openness of the practice. 'Their names were entered in a book which was kept in the deepest secrecy, and on the death of Pelham was burnt by the King' (Wraxall's *Memoirs*). At a later period we find Bute distributing as much as £25,000 in one day to purchase members. Walpole, the great Whig minister earlier in the eighteenth century, is credited with the statement that 'every man has his price,' and with having acted upon it on a vast scale.

21. *head-money . . . freeman* : *douceur* paid by a member of Parliament to the electors (freemen) of his borough.

33. *triennial Parliaments* : triennial Parliaments were established by Parliament in 1694. In 1716 the Whig Government passed the Septennial Act, enforcing dissolution after seven years instead of three. The Government wished to avoid a general election, fearing defeat owing to the prevalent Tory and Jacobite agitation. The result was that Parliament was able to continue and govern in spite of a change in the will of the people. The period has been reduced to five years by the Parliament Act, 1911.

PAGE 73. 4. Sir William Wyndham (1687-1740) was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1713. An extreme Tory and Jacobite, he was imprisoned in the Tower during the Jacobite revolt of 1715. The leader of the Tory party, he was a notable orator, and strongly opposed Walpole, especially on this question of triennial Parliaments. Drummond's opinion in this connection is worth quoting: 'I have no faith in anything new, and I dislike Septennial Parliaments because they are a Whig invention.'

17. *electoral districts* : Hume wished the country to be divided into constituencies the population of which should be approximately equal.

21. *the new party* : the Radicals.

PAGE 74. 15. *mortification* : Disraeli sat as member for Buckinghamshire.

29. *ship-money* : an ancient levy upon coast towns and counties for the purpose of supplying ships and men for the King's Navy. It was changed to a money levy upon all counties by Charles I in 1635. John Hampden (1594-1643), member for Wendover in Buckinghamshire then, resisted the levy in 1637. Judgement was given in the Courts against him in 1638. The Long Parliament, however, passed an Act in 1641 declaring the impost illegal. The question was one of the many exciting causes of the Great Rebellion, and Hampden is looked upon as a hero in the cause of liberty.

30. *Grand Remonstrance* : in November 1640, at the opening of the Long Parliament, Lord Digby moved for a remonstrance to the King, showing the abuses of the monarchy and the case of the Commons against the King. It was passed in November 1641, presented to the King in December, and printed, after agitated debates. The Grand Remonstrance certainly hastened the Civil War.

40. *the last reconstruction* : in 1832 the Chandos Clause, enfranchising £50 tenants in county constituencies, was added in Committee by the Marquis of Chandos, then member for Buckinghamshire.

PAGE 75. 24. *Alexander Mackay* (1808-1852) was then on the staff of the *Morning Chronicle*. The pamphlet was entitled *Electoral Districts ; an inquiry into the working of the Reform Bill*.

PAGE 76. 1. *seven Richards in the field* : a misquotation from Shakespeare :

'I think there be six Richmonds in the field.'

(*Richard III*, Act V, Sc. 4, line 11.)

14. *Marquis of Granby* (1815-1888), subsequently sixth Duke of Rutland.

15. *Dublin Committee* : a Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into a petition challenging the election of the member for Dublin on grounds of bribery. From the end of the sixteenth century such petitions were dealt with by the Committee of Privileges and Elections. Obviously such a method did not exclude party influence. In 1868 the Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices Act enacted that such petitions should be presented to the Courts of Justice and judged by the Court of Common Pleas, the Judge thereupon reporting to the Speaker, who acts upon his finding.

32. *recent experience* : in France after the Revolution of 1848 the Republican Government, based on universal suffrage, was unable to restore order, and various wild schemes, such as the 'national workshops,' only increased the disorder. The crisis ended in the despotism of Napoleon III.



PAGE 77. 4. *Manchester school*: see Introduction, pp. 20, 21.

9. *I prefer the liberty*: Disraeli prefers practical, existing liberty to theories of ideal liberty. The sentence is an appeal to the insular patriotism of tradition.

39. *Mr. Pitt*: William Pitt the younger (1759–1806), who rose to power, and dominated the Whig oligarchy and the coterie of the King's Friends at the end of the eighteenth century, by the support of middle-class public opinion, thereby rendering Parliament responsible to the nation.

PAGE 78. 3. *aggravated the horrors*: the abolition of the slave-trade tended to make worse the condition of the remaining slaves.

7. *Ten Hours' Bill*: various measures were passed between 1847 and 1850 restricting the time of actual labour in certain industries to ten hours a day.

10. *colonial reform*: the granting of measures of self-government in the colonies began with Canada in 1841 and Australia in 1850.

22. *proof of that fact*: the Reform Bill of 1832 did not satisfy the reformers, for it resulted in further demands, as instanced by this motion.

23. *commercial reform*: the Corn Laws were repealed in 1846 by Peel. The controversy is by no means settled yet.

PAGE 79. 7. *realised property*: land, houses, funds, *e.g.*, as distinguished from capital employed in industry in particular.

PAGE 80. 11. *a new profession*: the profession of paid political agitator. Disraeli is at his best in such a display of biting raillery as now follows. It is, in truth, a danger when politics becomes professional politics.

25. *Rhetor, etc.*:

'Rhetorician, grammarian, geometrician, painter, anointer, Augur, tight-rope dancer, physician, magician.'

(Juvenal, *Satires*, III. 76, 77.)

Juvenal is complaining of the invasion of Syrian quacks and vices.

39. *Member for Tamworth*: Sir Robert Peel, who repealed the Corn Laws. The Anti-Corn Law League, however, decided to continue in virtual existence, transferring its activities into other channels.

PAGE 81. 4. *went abroad*: Cobden was abroad on the Continent from August 1846 to October 1847, preaching free trade, and receiving much honour.

8. *general war . . . the unhappy affair at Paris*: the French Revolution of 1848 spread revolution into other countries.

23. *the journal*: the *Manchester Guardian*.

37. *locus in quo*: literally 'the place in which,' *i.e.* in which they met.

PAGE 82. 6. *George Wilson* (1808–1870) was a business man and politician, and seems to have been in universal request as a chairman. When the Anti-Corn-Law League was founded in 1841, he was made Chairman until it was dissolved in 1846, when Wilson received a gift of £10,000 from the Council of the League. (They

had raised £250,000 by subscription to carry on the propaganda.) Subsequently he was chairman of the Lancashire Reformers' Union (1858), of the National Reform Union (1864), and of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (1867). Cobden, it is to be remembered, also received large gifts from reformers—over £50,000.

PAGE 83. 31. *country party*: the country, as distinguished from the towns, has always been mainly Conservative.

PAGE 84. 5. *Hynde Cotton*: Sir John Hynde Cotton (d. 1752) was a prominent Jacobite leader of the Opposition during Walpole's administration.

This refers perhaps to a suffrage motion brought by Sir F. Dashwood in 1745, when Cotton was Treasurer of the Chamber.

8. *pair*: when a member wishes to be absent from the House, he tries to find a member of the opposite party who also wishes to be absent. If both are absent together their absence does not affect the divisions, and they are said to *pair*, if they agree upon such an arrangement.

41. *the great body of the people*: the spirit of the whole speech shows clearly the lines on which Disraeli was to revive Conservatism and to rescue it from the domination of middle-class Liberalism, namely, by creating democratic Conservatism.

### III

#### INTERNATIONAL REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

PAGE 85. 2. *a motion*: the motion was lost by 76 votes to 31. Malt is imported, chiefly from Germany, for use in manufacturing beer.

*Mr. M. T. Bass*: Michael Thomas Bass (1799–1884) was the grandson of the founder of the famous brewery, and was M.P. for Derby from 1848 to 1883.

4. *Mr. Roebuck*: John Arthur Roebuck (1801–1879), a lawyer and politician, was born at Madras. He was M.P. for Bath in 1832, and then a strong Radical. He sat for Sheffield 1849–1868 and 1874–1879, evolving into a Jingo supporter of Palmerston; like Palmerston also, on the side of the South in the American Civil War. His support of Cobden in this case is interesting.

*Mr. Gibson*: Thomas Milner Gibson (1806–1884) was born in Trinidad, and sat for Ipswich in 1837 and after 1841 for Manchester. He was Cobden's lieutenant in the Free Trade agitation, was Vice-President of the Board of Trade from 1846 to 1848 under Russell, and President from 1859 to 1866 under Palmerston and Russell.

5. *Mr. Urquhart*: David Urquhart (1805–1877) sat for Stafford 1847–1852, and was an opponent of Palmerston.

*amicable explanation*: Cobden wished the Government to enter into negotiations with France in order to obtain a mutual reduction of armaments. Lord Palmerston explained that he could not accept any motion which would bind the Government to any specific action, but that he approved of the principle, and trusted Mr. Cobden would not press the matter to a division.



The history of recent negotiations of a similar character between England and Germany is painfully instructive.

6. *Palmerston*: Henry John Temple, third Viscount Palmerston (1784–1865), entered Parliament in 1807, and sat for Tiverton (1835–1865) as a member of the Whig party. He was Secretary for War from 1809 to 1828, and Secretary for Foreign Affairs from 1830 to 1841 and from 1846 to 1852, becoming Prime Minister in 1855 for a period of ten years. His administration was notable for his aggressive foreign policy.

PAGE 86. 26. *more economical*: I fear professional economists could hardly agree with this sweeping opinion. Such a remark makes one question the value of Cobden's judgement regarding free trade, for example. To begin with, this would withdraw a large amount of money from normal circulation, upon which the welfare of a country depends. Secondly, it would either seriously deplete the gold balance or cause confusion in funds and industries. It is somewhat difficult to throw millions of money away!

40. *Chamber of Deputies*: France was governed in 1848 by a King, Louis Philippe, a Chamber of Peers, and a Chamber of Deputies.

PAGE 87. 1. *Thiers*: Louis Adolphe Thiers (1797–1877) was a great historian, journalist, and statesman. He wrote a *History of the French Revolution* (1823–1827) in ten volumes, and a *History of the Consulate and the Empire* (1845). He held office under the monarchy from 1832 to 1840, and after the Revolution in 1870 was President of the Republic from 1871 to 1873.

10. *the noble Lord below me*: Viscount Palmerston. See note on p. 85, 6.

PAGE 88. 5. *steam guard-ships*: the first steam passenger ship was made in 1812, the first steam warship, a paddle steamer, was the British ship, the *Cyclops*, made in 1838, and the first screw warship was built in 1842, since when a rapid development took place.

On the whole, the armament-race was started by France. In 1815 only the British Navy remained a formidable force. The French increased their Navy largely from 1815 to 1830 under the Restoration, and from 1830 to 1848 under Louis Philippe. Therefore, in 1838, an agitation began in England to increase the Navy. The French had at one time three times as many war-steamers as England, and built the first of the modern floating fortresses in the ironclad *La Gloire* in 1859.

It must be remembered that these first steamships were converted sailing-ships.

*Admiralty*: the Board of Admiralty represents the Lord High Admiral of former times, and exercises his functions. It consists of seven members, one First Lord, who is a member of Parliament and is a Cabinet Minister responsible to Parliament, four Sea Lords who are naval officers, one Civil Lord, and one Parliamentary Secretary, who is a member of Parliament and deals mainly with finance.

31. *Mr. Ward*: Sir Henry George Ward (1797–1860) sat in Parliament from 1832 to 1849, and was Parliamentary Secretary to

the Admiralty from 1846 to 1849. He was Governor of Ceylon from 1855 to 1860, and was appointed Governor of Madras in 1860, but died of cholera on arrival there.

PAGE 89. 10. *Sir Francis Baring* (1796-1866) was the grandson of the founder of the famous Baring's Bank. He was M.P. for Portsmouth from 1826 to 1865, Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1839 to 1841, and First Lord of the Admiralty from 1849 to 1852. He was raised to the peerage as Baron Northbrook in 1866.

31. *Admiral Napier*: Sir Charles Napier (1786-1860) served in the French War from 1799 to 1815, in Portugal in 1829, and against Egypt in 1840. In 1840 he was made K.C.B., and was elected to Parliament in 1841. In 1847 he received the command of the Channel Fleet, and from 1855 onwards was prominent in navy reforms.

34. *Jersey and Alderney* are two of the Channel Islands, close to the French coast. The works at Alderney, said Palmerston, were of a trifling nature compared with the huge arsenal at Cherbourg. They, however, cost £600,000.

PAGE 90. 26. *Keyham*: in Plymouth Sound. No one but an apostle of disarmament would wish this harbour to be unprotected, as it is one of the chief British naval bases. It is true, however, that it would seem unnecessary to fortify Keyham, which is an inner part of the Sound, if the outer lines of defence are held.

28. *fee-simple*: an estate in land held absolutely in perpetuity.

PAGE 91. 7. *Dunkirk*, on account of its situation, could serve as a base for an attack upon England. So, for example, it was from Dunkirk that Parma's army was to co-operate with the Armada in 1588 against England. Its fortifications had already been demolished in 1713. It had always served as a refuge and base for French corsairs and privateers, which were a constant menace to English shipping.

34. *Sir G. Murray*: Sir George Murray (1772-1846) was a noted soldier and politician. He was Quartermaster-General under Wellington in the Peninsular War, was Governor of Canada from 1814 to 1815 at the time of this letter, entered Parliament as member for Perth in 1823, and was Colonial Secretary in Wellington's administration from 1828 to 1830.

37. *sine qua non*: literally 'without which, not,' i.e. an essential condition.

PAGE 92. 12. *the relation*: no doubt England might have been content to limit armaments on the basis of a superiority of three to two; but why should France then, any more than Germany recently, have been content to remain in inferiority?

15. *Lord Auckland*: George Eden, first Earl of Auckland (1784-1849), was in the Cabinet from 1830 to 1834, was Governor-General of India from 1835 to 1842, and was First Lord of the Admiralty in 1846.

22. *California*: I presume that Cobden means 'when California was ceded to the United States by Mexico in 1848.' California was 'discovered' by the Spaniards in 1540!

29. *Russia*: Russia had at this time a fleet little inferior to the French fleet.



31. *Mehemet Ali* (1769-1849) was an Albanian, and became Pasha of Egypt in 1805. He raised a fleet and army with the help of French officers, and rebelled successfully against the Sultan of Turkey, his suzerain, in 1831. The rivalry between France and the other Powers as to who should intervene to settle the question nearly led to war between England and France in 1840. Mehemet Ali was made hereditary Pasha of Egypt in 1841, and developed the country considerably upon European modern lines.

*fellahs*: the *fellah* of Egypt corresponds to the *raiya* in India.

34. *Cronstadt*: the great Russian Baltic port and fortress.

37. *skippers*: the word 'skipper' is a colloquialism for ship's master or captain.

PAGE 93. 2. *can ever be endangered*: this was no doubt more or less true when naval warfare was largely a question of seamanship, but in modern warfare equipment and technical training are more important, and the amateur, however enthusiastic and however skilled as a seaman, is practically useless. A seafaring nation, of course, gives better material for training.

13. *nations are disposed for peace*: subsequent history offers an ironical commentary upon this opinion, for it exhibits a continuous succession of wars: the Crimean War, the Franco-Austrian War, the American Civil War, the Austro-Prussian War, the Franco-German War, the Russo-Turkish War, the Chino-Japanese War, the Spanish-American War, the South African War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Balkan War, and the present European War. Not a decade has passed without a war of large proportions.

32. *convulsions*: the French Republican Revolution of 1848 was the most striking manifestation of the revolt of the democracy of Europe against autocratic government, and the movement towards liberalism spread to other continental nations, enforcing violently the grant of parliamentary constitutions and the abrogation of the privileges of aristocracies.

PAGE 94. 30. *the noble Lord*: Lord John Russell (1792-1878) was Prime Minister and Palmerston Foreign Secretary.

PAGE 95. 24. *one common temple*: Cobden is referring to the Great Exhibition, which was opened by Queen Victoria in May 1851 and remained open until October in the same year. A huge building, mainly of glass, was built in Hyde Park, London, for the purposes of this international exhibition of industries. The building was subsequently removed to Sydenham, and is known as the Crystal Palace.

35. *An address*: the usual Address to the Throne is the reply of Parliament to the Speech from the Throne, containing the ministerial policy, to the Houses of Parliament at the beginning of the session. The debate upon the Address is thus a trial of the strength of the Ministry, being a debate upon its general policy. A particular Address like this partakes of the nature of a Resolution or of a Motion conveying the Will of the House to the Government, and would bind the Ministry to action.

This motion was withdrawn, upon Lord Palmerston's explanation following Cobden's speech.

## IV

## SLAVERY AND SECESSION IN AMERICA

PAGE 96. 4. *the cotton districts*: the chief industry of Lancashire is cotton-weaving and spinning. The Civil War in America entailed a cessation of the supply of raw cotton, as the ports of the Southern cotton-producing States were blockaded by the Northern States. See Introduction, pp. 25, 26.

20. *brotherly interest*: Bright was a Quaker, and therefore an apostle of peace.

PAGE 97. 5. *establishment of independence*: the Declaration of Independence by the American colonies dates from 1776, and the establishment of the independence of the United States from 1783, after the War of Independence (1775-1783).

6. *war of 1812*: war broke out, lasting from 1812 to 1815, between England and the United States, as a result of the restrictions upon American trade caused by England's blockade of Europe.

12. *Mr. Ashworth*: Henry Ashworth (1794-1880); like Bright, a Quaker, a prosperous manufacturer, a friend of Cobden's, and one of the founders of the Anti-Corn-Law League.

21. *Suffolk*: this raillery indicates something of that slightly offensive attitude of the citizens of the large industrial towns towards the country districts at this time, and no doubt it pleased the citizens of Rochdale.

36. *Tim Bobbin*: the pseudonym of John Collier (1708-1786), a somewhat disreputable Lancashire author and painter; at different times a wandering schoolmaster, and a clerk. He is known as the Lancashire Hogarth, from his caricatures of a coarse sort. He also was a student of the dialect, and published humorous works in it, with engravings of his own.

38. *valued friends*: Bright refers to Edwin Waugh (1817-1890), a self-educated poet, who is known in Lancashire as the Lancashire Burns, and who wrote in the dialect.

PAGE 98. 5. *Dryden*: John Dryden (1631-1700), a dramatic poet in tragedy and comedy, a lyric, epic, and satiric poet, and a notable prose-writer, critic, and translator of Vergil. He was made Poet-Laureate in 1670, and was the literary dictator of his time, and a man of powerful and universal genius.

*Pope*: Alexander Pope (1688-1744) succeeded Dryden as the dictator of English poetry, and was a master of the formal arts of poetry. He was mainly a satiric and didactic poet, and wrote a notable translation of Homer.

*Byron*: George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824), is the famous and popular romantic poet, author of many verse-romances, one great satiric romance, and many lyrics. His unfortunate life partly explains his lyric pessimism. He died fighting in Greece for the cause of Greek independence.

*Wordsworth*: William Wordsworth (1770-1850) is the greatest of English philosophic and moral poets, and one of the greatest lyric poets.



*Tennyson* : see note below on p. 177, 8.

9. *Free States* : Bright refers to the Northern anti-slavery States.

23. *our constitution* : this is a very different interpretation of the English Constitution from that of Disraeli. Bright bases it upon the theoretical rights of man, like the American and the French Constitutions. Disraeli interprets it as a system of gradually spreading privilege. Disraeli's is undoubtedly the more historically true account. The English Constitution has never been fixed or constructed upon theories, but has been a gradual growth and a series of expedients. It is, therefore, extremely different from the American Constitution, which was based upon an explicit declaration of the rights of man.

35. *ark of refuge* : like the Ark in which Noah took refuge from the Deluge.

PAGE 99. 5. *the enormous stride* : the advance of Liberal institutions.

PAGE 100. 2. *it is free* : i.e. the land is free, and may be bought or sold without, for example, the restrictions of entail.

The rosy view which Bright takes of the United States was shared by very many at this time, and we find Froude speaking to much the same effect in his speech on Education. Yet by the end of the nineteenth century political corruption in America had become a notorious evil, and to-day the American aristocracy of wealth wields a greater power than the English aristocracy of birth and privilege, with lower ideals. Further, whatever the theories underlying the American Constitution, as a matter of fact England affords a greater measure of freedom to her citizens.

PAGE 101. 26. *slavery in Brazil* : slavery was not abolished finally in Brazil until 1888, nor in Cuba until 1886.

*Cuba* was one of the original centres of slave-labour. It was in the possession of Spain until 1899, when it passed into the hands of the United States after the Spanish-American War. In 1902 it was made an independent republic, with indifferent results.

PAGE 102. 13. *Richmond* is the capital of the State of Virginia.

14. *Confederacy* : the Northern States were the *Federal* States, seeking to enforce a Federal Union of all the States. The Southern States were the *Confederate* States which seceded from the Union and sought to form a separate republic.

36. *Mr. Cobb* : Howell Cobb (1815-1868) was Governor of the State of Georgia, and subsequently President of the Convention of the Seceded States.

PAGE 104. 11. *a compact of their own* : they subscribed to the Declaration of Independence in 1776, and to the Constitution in 1787.

31. *That is not all these people have done* : I cannot find any justification for the following argument. The blockade of the Southern ports by the Northern navy seems to have been absolute after a time.

It would obviously harm the North to allow Southern trade to continue. It would obviously be of advantage to the North to cripple the trade and the resources of the South, and distress in Lancashire increased as the blockade by the North became more effective.

38. *New Orleans* : the great port at the mouth of the Mississippi River.

PAGE 105. 25. *Chartists* : the Chartists were a party of popular agitators who were active from 1838 to 1848. They took their name from the *People's Charter*, in which their demands were formulated.

32. *Senator* : a senator is a member of the Upper House of Parliament in America. The Congress of the United States consists of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

PAGE 106. 18. *Mr. Yancey, etc.* : these three men were Confederate envoys, and sailed to England on the *Trent*. They were captured, and taken off the ship by the Federals. The *Trent* was an English ship, and a dispute followed which nearly brought England to war with the North. The envoys were subsequently released and continued their journey.

21. *Fugitive Slave Law* : see Introduction, p. 24. The law of 1850 was extremely harsh and unfair, using all the powers of the State to ensure the return of fugitive slaves to their owners. It was repealed in 1864.

32. *felony* : slave-trading was declared felony by Act of Parliament in 1816.

33. *Pandemonium* : the name of the palace of Satan in Hell, in Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

PAGE 107. 3. *We supply the ships* : Confederate privateers were fitted out in English ports for blockade-running and for commerce-destroying. The famous *Alabama*, in particular, an ironclad, did great damage. Laird's shipbuilding firm took a positive pride in the exploits of the ships from their yard.

10. *newspapers* : *The Times*, for example, published an article maintaining that slavery was not forbidden in the Bible.

11. *English statesmen* : Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone, in particular. Mr. Roebuck brought a motion in 1863 to recognise the Confederation. Mr. Gladstone merely deprecated it, while admitting the impossibility of union.

14. *a member of the present Government* : Bright refers to Sir Robert Peel (1822-1895), the son of the famous Sir Robert Peel who repealed the Corn Laws. He was Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1861 to 1865 under Palmerston.

27. *the middle classes* : Bright exaggerates. On the whole, the sympathies of the great majority of the English were with the South, for various reasons. Most periodicals of the time show this, and even Cobden had to be converted by Bright.

41. *Exeter Hall* : the chief meeting-place for reform, missionary, and other similar activities. This meeting took place on January 29, 1863.

PAGE 108. 7. *Who was there?* Thomas Hughes, the author of *Tom Brown's School-days* (1857), was the 'novelist' spoken of, Mr. Newman Hall and Mr. Baptist Noel the two 'dissenting ministers.' Mr. Holyoake was the chief speaker, together with Mr. Taylor, M.P. The *Saturday Review* spoke of the meeting with much contempt.

27. *Jefferson* : Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) was one of the



makers of modern America. He was Minister to France from 1785 to 1789, and was elected President of the United States, being the third to hold the office, and was in office from 1801 to 1809.

PAGE 109. 17. *one foul blot*: the evil of slavery.

22. *to heal the broken-hearted*, etc.: cf. Bible, Book of Isaiah, chapter 61, and St. Luke, chapter 4, 18.

35. *destruction*: it was unfortunately true that certain English politicians rejoiced in the thought, and expressed the wish, that the Civil War might ruin America, a dangerous rival.

38. *men*: e.g. Gladstone. See note above, on p. 107, 11.

PAGE 110. 5. '*For I have seen*,' etc.: I have not traced this quotation. The metaphor was a frequent one with Elizabethan poets, as was natural in that seafaring age. The opening words have a Shakespearean sound, but Shakespeare was not yet born in 1563.

## V

### THE EXTENSION OF THE SUFFRAGE

PAGE 111. 1. *Lord Grosvenor*: M.P. for Chester; afterwards Marquess and first Duke of Westminster.

2. *motion*: the debate on the second reading of the Representation of the People Bill began on April 12, 1866, when the question was put, 'That this bill be now read a second time,' and the amendment was moved, 'To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question in order to add the words, "this House, while ready to consider, with a view to its settlement, the question of Parliamentary Reform, is of opinion that it is inexpedient to discuss a bill for the reduction of the franchise in England and Wales until the House has before it the entire scheme contemplated by the Government for the amendment of the Representation of the People."'

In other words, the amendment proposed to reject the bill dealing with the franchise unless accompanied by a bill dealing with redistribution of seats. Mr. Gladstone rose, as the member of the Government responsible for the bill, to close the debate, after the leader of the Opposition, Disraeli, had spoken on April 27, the final night of the debate. He had no enviable task, for the secession of Liberals was considerable; Disraeli had, as usual, made a very effective speech, and the temper of the House was very uncertain and not amenable to Gladstone's uncompromising and imperious methods. The end of his speech shows that he understood this, for he finishes upon a note of defiance rather than of confidence.

4. *sir*: Gladstone addresses the Speaker, as is the invariable usage in the House of Commons. But cf. note on p. 47, 1.

*an authoritative source*: Disraeli, as the leader of the official Tory Opposition.

6. *Oh, oh!* etc.: interruptions from various members. 'Oh, oh!' signifies incredulity, 'Hear, hear!' signifies approval, 'Order!'

signifies a breach of parliamentary rule, in this case the disturbance caused by the members shouting, 'Oh, oh,' etc.

12. *working class*: Gladstone's bill added 200,000 electors in the boroughs.

14. *American principles*: i.e. on a basis of universal suffrage, or on republican principles. Many Tories had used this argument. Disraeli had urged that England needed a House of Commons, not a House of the People, after the American fashion, and that the vote was a privilege, not a 'right of man,' as the Americans declared it to be.

18. *eight nights*: the debate took up eight evenings at intervals from April 12 to April 27.

20. *the defence*: Disraeli urged that there was no demand for Reform, and that both Whigs and Tories had failed to force Reform through Parliament recently.

PAGE 112. 23. *Palmerston*: the leader of Gladstone's party until his death in 1865.

33. *his own bill*: the bill was brought in by Russell; it reduced the county franchise to £10, and the borough franchise to £6, and increased the borough voters from 440,000 to 636,000.

36. *Committee*: after a bill has passed its second reading, it is discussed, clause by clause, by the House sitting as a committee, presided over, not by the Speaker, but by a Chairman. The Speaker leaves the chair, and the House resolves itself into a Committee of the whole House. A member may then address the House more than once on the same question. Any amendments or improvements then made must be subsequently approved by the House at the third reading, and by the Lords. The main practical work of legislation is carried on in Committee.

PAGE 113. 25. *dissolution*: Parliament is dissolved by the Crown automatically after it has continued in existence for five years, or at the request of the Cabinet, generally upon a defeat of the Government in the House of Commons, and a new Parliament elected in a General Election.

28. *a speech of mine*: Disraeli referred to a speech of Gladstone's delivered eighteen months previously in the House. Gladstone, he said, argued that the franchise should be established on the rights of man, and therefore it should be granted to the working classes, as an approximation to this theory. The movement, said Disraeli, was checked by Palmerston, but was revived immediately upon his death.

39. *Secretary for the Home Department*: Sir George Grey was then Home Secretary, and was present. Gladstone again refers to him presently as 'my right honourable Friend.'

41. *appeal to the country*: the Tories urged that Reform had not been part of the 'platform' of the Liberals during the General Election, and that therefore they could not claim to have either a pledge or a mandate from the people for this measure.

PAGE 114. 18. *his lamented death*: Palmerston died on October 18, immediately after the Election.



36. *the rules of Parliament* : in this case, the rule of strict parliamentary courtesy towards his opponents.

PAGE 115. 1. *Member for Birmingham* : Bright was the Member for Birmingham, and his name was much in evidence in this debate. Disraeli and Cranbourne pointed to him as the real leader of the Liberals, and the opinion was general, and not altogether without reason, though Bright was not a Minister. Grant, a Liberal, argued indeed that the Government had pledged their word to Bright in this matter, and were keeping it, against Gladstone's own better judgement. Bright dealt with Lowe, the most dangerous opponent, more successfully than Gladstone, in this debate.

21. *honourable and learned* : this is the correct parliamentary way of referring to a member who is a lawyer, as 'right honourable' is correct for a member who is on the Privy Council, 'honourable and gallant' for an officer of the Army or Navy, 'honourable Friend' for a member of the same party, etc.

PAGE 116. 6. *a speech delivered by him* : on January 3, not in the autumn.

40. *differ with him* : Gladstone's bill proposed a £14 county and a £7 borough franchise.

PAGE 117. 4. *member for Calne* : the Right Honourable Robert Lowe, subsequently Viscount Sherbrooke (1811-1892), was a scholar, politician, and orator. He was called to the Bar in 1842, and was in Australia from 1842 to 1850, sitting on the Legislative Council of New South Wales, and distinguishing himself there as a popular reformer. Returning to England, he entered Parliament in 1852, sat on the India Board from 1852 to 1855, held office in the ministries of Trade and Education subsequently, and was in office when Russell's Reform Bill of 1860 was brought forward. In 1859 he became Member for Calne. He seceded from the Liberal party in 1866 on the question of Reform, and his eloquence mainly decided the fate of the bill. He was thus for the time the political enemy of Gladstone, as this speech shows. He was, however, Chancellor of the Exchequer under Gladstone from 1868 to 1873, and Home Secretary from 1873 to 1874. He was raised to the peerage in 1880, and received many other honours. He was a notable and popular figure, and an effective orator distinguished for learning and sarcasm.

18. *Sir George Lewis* : Sir George Cornwall Lewis (1806-1863) was a Liberal statesman, an author, linguist, and scholar. He refused the Governorship of Bombay in 1853, was Chancellor of the Exchequer under Palmerston from 1855 to 1858, Home Secretary in 1859, and Secretary for War in 1861.

PAGE 118. 18. *Member for King's Lynn* : the Right Hon. Lord Stanley.

24. *'flesh and blood'* : on Friday, April 6, Gladstone delivered a speech at a banquet of the Liberal Legislation Society at Liverpool in which he answered a public letter and a speech of Lowe's. It was a somewhat oratorical, if not imprudent, speech. He accused the Tories of speaking of the working classes as 'an invading army,' maintained that, on the contrary, they were not enemies but 'our

own flesh and blood' (and he never heard the last of that phrase), and ended up with a desperate peroration: 'We have crossed the Rubicon, and burnt our boats.' His explanation that this was not intended as an argument for the passing of the bill is somewhat lame and unnecessary.

39. *right honourable friend*: Mr. Lowe, who ended his denunciation of the measure, which Gladstone hardly exaggerates, with an illustration from Vergil, invoking the Wooden Horse and the Fall of Troy. Cf. Note on p. 145, 31, below.

PAGE 120. 3. *Member for Stamford*: Viscount Cranbourne protested against Gladstone's defamation at Liverpool of the Tory party.

28. *Member for South Lincolnshire*: Mr. James Banks Stanhope.

PAGE 122. 27. *self-government* began in Australia in 1850 with Russell's Australian Colonies Bill, establishing Legislative Councils in each of the colonies. It was followed by the New Constitution Act in 1855, and the first responsible government was established in New South Wales in 1856.

32. *Regent Duke*: Philip, Duke of Orleans (1674-1723), a brilliant but dissolute prince, was Regent of France during the minority of Louis XV, from 1715 to 1723.

*Princess Palatine*: There were two Palatinates, principalities of the Empire, since 1648, the Lower and the Upper or Bavarian Palatinates. Their rulers were styled Counts-Palatine, or Electors-Palatine.

PAGE 123. 4. *insulted the House*: Lowe accused the Government of withholding information from the House. Further, he said, 'The Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking to an applauding audience at Liverpool, deliberately tells them that he knows the people with whom he has to deal; that is, of course, that the House of Commons is not to be trusted.'

Lord Elcho, Member for Haddingtonshire, spoke of the Government's 'indecent haste,' its 'tyranny of Saul,' and accused it of dealing harshly. Gladstone certainly was not an urbane minister!

28. *the Member for Cambridge University*: the Rt. Hon. Spencer Walpole sat for Cambridge University, and Mr. Joseph Henley for Oxfordshire.

PAGE 124. 4. *Aristophanes*: the greatest of Greek writers of satirical comedies. The quotation is taken from *The Acharnians*, lines 516-517. An exact translation would have afforded Lowe a neat reply, for it runs thus: 'I do not mean the State, but certain rascally fellows, base coin, unfranchised and counterfeit!'

13. *confining myself, etc.*: Gladstone is careful again to avoid formal discourtesy.

PAGE 125. 27. *Member for Northamptonshire*: Gladstone refers to Mr. G. W. Hunt, who on April 20 pressed for statistics regarding the county franchise, as did indeed Lord Burghley also, the other member for Northamptonshire.



PAGE 126. 2. *the Motion for going into Committee*: the form of the Motion is invariably 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair.'

PAGE 127. 3. *formerly combined*: Russell's bill of 1860 combined Franchise and Redistribution.

15. *Member for Huntingdon*: General Peel said, 'I draw the greatest possible distinction between the personal honour . . . and the political honour of right hon. gentlemen opposite. For the one I have a great respect, for the other none at all.'

PAGE 128. 9. *Earl Russell*: Lord John Russell, subsequently Earl Russell (1792-1878), entered Parliament in 1813. He moved resolutions touching Parliamentary Reform yearly from 1819; accepted office, without a seat in the Cabinet, in 1830, and was charged with the conduct of the Reform Bill of 1831-32 in the Commons. He furthered the cause of religious freedom, as in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, in Catholic Emancipation in 1829, in the Dissenters Marriage Act in 1836, and in the removal of Jewish disabilities in 1848.

15. *errors of my boyhood*: Disraeli had taunted Gladstone with his opposition to Parliamentary Reform in the Oxford University Union, at a debate held in Wyatt's Rooms in 1831. Gladstone was then twenty-one years old.

16. *Member for Westminster*: John Stuart Mill, the famous political economist and philosopher, not only 'twenty-five years ago' but also in 1859, had advocated universal suffrage on a basis of direct taxation, including women's suffrage. These doctrines were certainly inconsistent with his present attitude.

36. *Canning*: George Canning (1770-1827) entered Parliament in 1793 as a follower of Pitt, and took office in 1796 as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He achieved literary and political fame by the periodical, the *Anti-Jacobin*, opposing revolutionary tendencies. In 1799 he attempted a Union with Ireland, giving equal rights to Catholics. He was in office at various times under Pitt and Portland, and was a very strong Foreign Minister in a period of great stress. He showed his Liberalism in the Emancipation of Catholics, achieved in 1829 after his death, in his support of Liberalism abroad, in the recognition of the South American Republics, in his support of free trade and the abolition of slavery, and in securing the independence of Greece in 1827, in which year he became Prime Minister.

PAGE 129. 5. *Burke*: Edmund Burke (1729-1797) was an orator, statesman, and philosophical politician of literary celebrity. Alarmed by the French Revolution, in its anarchical stage, he spoke against it in the House in 1790, and published in November of the same year his famous *Reflections on the French Revolution*.

33. *an outcast*: Gladstone evolved from Toryism, through the intermediate Peelite party, to Liberalism. He entered Parliament as M.P. for Newark, but was rejected in 1841. He was again rejected by his new constituency, Oxford University, in 1865, for his now avowed Liberalism. His position had been made clear when he took office under Palmerston in 1859.

38. *as Dido received*, etc. : Dido, Queen of Carthage, received and loved Æneas, the hero of Vergil's epic, the *Æneid*, who took refuge with her on his flight from Troy. He soon after ungratefully deserted her, and this quotation is taken from her reproaches to her faithless lover.

The first phrase means, 'Outcast from the shore, needy as you were, I took you in,' and the second, 'Fool that I was, I made you partner in my kingdom' (*Æneid*, IV. 373-374).

PAGE 130. 28. *reason of policy* : the 1860 bill was ruined by the Redistribution measures and by Liberal dissentients.

PAGE 131. 17. *twelve-day . . . argument* : the bill was introduced for its First Reading on March 12, and for its Second Reading on April 12. The latest possible date for presenting it to the House of Lords was the middle of July, which afforded only twenty-four days for Government business, twelve of which had to be devoted to Estimates and Supply, leaving only twelve for Parliamentary Reform.

34. *Lord Derby* : in 1859, when Derby was Prime Minister, Disraeli brought forward his Conservative Reform Bill, which was rejected. In the General Election the Liberals won, Derby was beaten on the Address, and resigned office.

PAGE 132. 5. *four Reform Bills* : the Bills of 1851, 1854, 1859, and 1860.

18. *Member for West Surrey* : Gladstone means Mr. Locke King and his annual resolutions. He was Member for East Surrey, by the way, not West.

23. *Member for Leeds* : Mr. Edward Barnes sat for Leeds as a working-class member.

25. *legislation for Ireland* : the Irish Reform Bill of 1832 merely extended the franchise and provided no redistribution or disfranchisement of boroughs, however small.

PAGE 133. 3. *Addresses* : these are their Election Addresses, giving a summary of their political creed, and requesting the support of electors in the coming election.

35. *boundaries* : i.e. the boundaries of the constituencies.

PAGE 134. 11. *The other provisions of the bill* : the bill of 1859 did not change the general limits of the franchise, but added certain 'fancy' franchises, some based on personal property. It gave the vote to all who had an income of £10 from the Funds or £20 from pensions, to all professional men, and it established an identity of suffrage between counties and boroughs. All these provisions added mainly Tory voters, of course.

32. *the building of a house* : Lord Stanley said, 'All that I contend for now is that when we are framing . . . a new constitution, it is as insane an act to sanction part of the scheme without knowing the whole of it, as it would be to build a palace room by room without a general plan, with only the assurance of the architect that he knew his business.'

34. *Solicitor-General for Scotland* : Mr. George Young.



PAGE 135. 3. *to unite all the taxes*: in 1860 the Lords rejected the Paper Duty Bill, a financial measure. To prevent a recurrence of this interference with the constitutional control of the Commons over finance bills, Gladstone in 1861 proposed to include all financial acts of each year in one bill, commonly known as the Budget. This was opposed by Disraeli and Cecil, but the Lords finally accepted it. The obvious danger is, of course, that financial measures may 'carry on their backs' all manner of other legislation, from which they cannot be separated.

17. *proceed by resolution*: a resolution, or series of resolutions, such as that of Hume in 1848, would place one definite principle before the House, thereby avoiding the pitfalls of details. The procedure would also save time, escaping the long progress of First Reading, Second Reading, Committee, and Third Reading. The Budget is dealt with in this way for this reason, though the resolutions must subsequently be embodied in an Act and passed. The acceptance of such resolutions would pledge the House to a bill. The Opposition, moreover, would be forced into the open, and either declare in favour of Reform as a whole or against it, a dilemma from which the present bill saved them.

PAGE 136. 14. *The redistributions of the bill of 1854*: the bill of 1854 disfranchised towns of a population of less than 5,000, that of 1859 removed fifteen seats from small boroughs to large boroughs, and that of 1860 transferred twenty-five seats, one from each of twenty-five double boroughs, to populous towns.

32. *out of the counties*: as long as a town is not represented in Parliament by a member of its own, its inhabitants vote in the county or division of a county in which it is situated. As soon as the town was enfranchised a £7 qualification would entitle them to the vote, instead of £14 as before, and the number of voters would be increased.

40. *'cooking the constituencies'*: arranging the boundaries of constituencies by including or excluding districts known to be Tory or Liberal so as to secure a Tory or Liberal majority, or to secure the maximum of Tory or Liberal members throughout the country.

PAGE 138. 29. *we shall have offended many*: a constituency which would lose its franchise under the Redistribution Bill would still have the power to elect a member until the bill was passed, and would obviously elect a member pledged to oppose the Government.

PAGE 139. 31. *Member for Chester*: Lord Grosvenor was the Member for Chester, and, like Lowe, a Liberal.

41. *Savings Banks*: the bill enfranchised all who had deposits in the Savings Bank amounting to £50, if standing in their name for two years at least. Another clause, similar to one of Disraeli's bill of 1859, excluded men working in Government dockyards from the vote.

PAGE 140. 4. *Member for North Staffordshire*: the Right Hon. Charles Adderley maintained that the bill would swamp the agricultural interest in counties. In North Staffordshire, he said, it would add 3,428 leasehold voters to an original 11,000, and in North Warwickshire 5,000 to an original 6,000 or 7,000.

PAGE 141. 6-9. *I am bound to say . . . and no one else* : Gladstone's answer to the interruption.

39. *Mr. Hallam* : Henry Hallam (1777-1859) was a literary critic and historian, studying history especially from the constitutional aspect. His chief work is his *Constitutional History of England* (1827).

PAGE 142. 24. *that ancient war* : the war of the Greeks and Trojans, as related in Homer's *Iliad* and Vergil's *Aeneid*, and alluded to by Lowe frequently. This idea is taken, if not the exact phrase, from the famous Prayer for Light of Ajax in the *Iliad* (Book XVII. line 645).

PAGE 143. 17. *his own significant words* : Lowe said on March 13, 'We know what those persons are who live in small houses ; we have had experience of them under the name of freemen ; and no better law, I think, could have been passed than that which disfranchised them altogether.'

23. *Hyperboreans* : In Lowe's speech on March 12, he said, 'The ancients . . . imagined for themselves a blessed land . . . where the people, called the Hyperboreans, were always perfectly warm, happy, and virtuous.' This they imagined, he said, because they had observed that the farther north you go the colder it gets, and that if you could go northwards so far that you got *beyond the north wind* (this is the literal sense of the word) you would come to warmth again. So also, said Lowe, the lower you go in the social scale the worse the citizens, the lower the franchise the worse the constituencies ; but, go lower still, and no doubt you will come to the virtuous stratum again. . . .

In the same speech he used the following words also : 'If you want venality, if you want ignorance, if you want drunkenness, and facility for being intimidated, or if, on the other hand, you want impulsive, unreflecting, and violent people, where do you look for them in the constituencies ? Do you go to the top or to the bottom ?'

34. '*Do you think the franchise*,' etc. : in other words, 'Are you treating the franchise as a right of man in the abstract, or are you extending the franchise as a measure of practical and useful reform ?'

PAGE 144. 12. *a very eminent person* : the remark would certainly be characteristic of Carlyle, with his contempt for Parliaments and Ballots. He died in 1881.

23. *knots of men* : such 'knots and groups' were the freemen, liverymen, and burgage tenants, for example, with their special votes.

PAGE 145. 12. '*Got up* !' This phrase means 'organised factiously by outside influence, and not spontaneous manifestations of public opinion.'

31. *dismal pictures* : Lowe compared the British Constitution in its danger from this Bill to the fall of Troy after its invasion by the Wooden Horse with Greek warriors concealed in it.

PAGE 146. 3. *scot-and-lot voters* : 'Scot' means taxes in general, and 'lot' means the share of each man in the taxes. The phrase includes those householders who had the vote by virtue of paying part of the taxes levied on towns.



*freemen* : the freemen of a corporation elected the members for boroughs from the time of Henry VII until 1832.

6. 3 *Hansard, clii.* 1066 : this refers to the Third Series of Hansard's Official Parliamentary Reports, volume 152, column 1066.

38. *per penny* : i.e. an income-tax of one penny in the pound would produce a total revenue of £850,000. The income-tax was first introduced as a war-rate by Pitt in 1799, and reached the maximum of 10 per cent. in 1806 to 1815. It was removed from 1815 to 1841, when Peel imposed 7d. in the pound. It was gradually reduced to 1d. in 1860; it was 2d. in 1863. In 1873 Gladstone hoped to abolish it altogether, but it has become a permanent and elastic source of revenue.

PAGE 147. 15. *the last few years* : Gladstone is thinking especially of the fine qualities displayed by the Lancashire working classes during the American Civil War. See Introduction, pp. 25, 26.

18. *less represented* : i.e. less in proportion than before the Bill of 1832.

PAGE 148. 6. *Ut pueris placeas, etc.* : in order to please children and become a theme for declamation (Juvenal, *Satires* X. 167). The Roman satirist refers to Hannibal and the futility of his expedition across the Alps into Italy (218-203 B.C.).

28. *Sir Robert Peel* (1788-1850) entered Parliament in 1809, was under-secretary for war and the colonies, 1810-12, and took office as Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1812, and as Home Secretary from 1822 to 1827. He became Prime Minister in 1841. His career, and the Peelite party which followed him, show a compromise between Conservatism and Liberalism, with a gradual evolution towards the latter. Peel opposed the Reform Bill of 1831-1832, and only abandoned his opposition to Catholic Emancipation when he found the country was resolved upon it. He was converted finally to Free Trade principles, and he repealed the Corn Laws in 1846. He was an honest man, and great as an administrator and financier.

PAGE 149. 37. *family of persons* : the Tories and the Liberal 'Adullamites.' See Introduction, p. 14.

PAGE 150. 4. *Privy Council* : from the beginning of English history there has existed a Royal Council, with executive power. This power was greatest under the Tudors and Stuarts, and was unworthily used then. This executive power is now held by the Cabinet, which was in its origin a committee of the Privy Council. The best known example of the survival of the powers of this Council is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the supreme legal court of the kingdom. It is less well known that the Board of Trade is constitutionally a Committee of the Council for Trade, and such is also the status of the Board of Education. Further, Orders in Council may be issued, when Parliament leaves a decision to the discretion of the Council. Mr. Walpole and Gladstone were wrong in their argument that a reference of the question to the Council would be unconstitutional.

11. *Member for Stroud, etc.* : The Rt. Hon. Edward Horsman, one of the Adullamites, sat for Stroud, Mr. Gregory sat for Galway, Mr. Samuel Laing for Wick, Sir Hugh Cairns, who was Solicitor-General

in 1858 under Lord Derby, sat for Belfast, Mr. Francis Powell for Cambridge, and Mr. Jonathan Pim for Dublin.

16. *pari passu* : the phrase means 'with equal step,' or simultaneously.

PAGE 152. 19. *my own share* : Gladstone had been opposed to the Reform Bill of 1832. See pp. 128, 129.

26. *since the epoch of the Reform Act* : a Liberal Ministry held power from 1831 to 1834 under Grey, a Liberal under Melbourne from 1834 to 1841, a Peelite under Peel from 1841 to 1846, a Liberal under Russell from 1846 to 1852, a Conservative under Derby from February 1852 to December 1852, a Liberal under Aberdeen from 1852 to 1855, a Liberal under Palmerston from 1855 to 1858, a Conservative under Derby from 1858 to 1859, and a Liberal under Palmerston and Russell from 1859-1866.

PAGE 153. 11. *Exoriare aliquis*, etc. : this quotation is taken from Vergil's *Æneid*, IV. 625, and means, 'May some avenger arise from our ashes.'

13. *The great social forces* : this is a magnificent peroration, and did not fail to extort the admiration, if not the support, of all present. It is to be noticed, however, that there is in it a certain threatening tone, and a tendency to exalt the people at the expense of Parliament, which could not be palatable to a House jealous of its prestige. This was a not infrequent error of Gladstone, over-confident in his cause and his power.

24. *The House divided* : the division was marked by scenes of wild excitement. The bill was narrowly saved for the time being. The triumph of the Opposition was completed in the next stage of the bill's progress in committee. An amendment moved by Lord Dunkellin in favour of a rating franchise instead of a rental franchise was passed against the Government by 315 to 304 votes, and the bill defeated.

## VI

### EDUCATION

PAGE 154. heading. *St. Andrews* is a seaport university town on the coast of Fife in Scotland. Its University, the oldest in Scotland, was constituted in 1413.

19. *the stage* : a frequent metaphor, especially in Shakespeare, for life.

22. *your Rector* : formerly the Lord Rector of a Scotch University was its executive head. It is now a post of an honorary nature, and is conferred upon men of public distinction, the sole duty being the delivery of the Rectorial Address to the students. The Rector is elected by the undergraduates of the University for a period of three years. The elections are generally contested and take on a political complexion. The Executive head of a Scotch University is now the Principal, and its supreme head is the Chancellor.

25. *history of the Reformation* : the story may be read in Knox's



own *History of the Reformation*. Froude also studied James Melville's *Memoirs*.

PAGE 155. 15. *John Knox* (1505–1572) was the leader of the Scotch Reformation. He was a priest and a theological scholar, and became a disciple of Calvin at Geneva from 1554 to 1558. He returned to Scotland in 1559, and was made minister of St. Giles's Church in Edinburgh. Thereafter he began to organise the Reformed Church in Scotland, wielding vast influence, with a heavy hand upon Queen Mary, no less a politician than a minister of religion.

He was captured by the French at St. Andrews in 1547, found guilty of heresy and condemned to the galleys, being released, however, in 1549. The ship in which he was rowing skirted the coast of Fife and sighted St. Andrews during its voyage.

26. *James Melville*: Sir James Melville (1535–1617) was a diplomatist and a courtier at the Court of Queen Mary and of James I in Scotland, and was knighted for his great services. His famous *Memoirs* of his own life were discovered in 1660, and were much drawn upon by Froude.

30. *know our duty and do it*: Froude interprets this conception of education somewhat widely, and apparently includes practical or technical training in the idea 'to know,' and a profession in the idea 'duty,' as well as the notion of moral duty.

33. *Duty*: cf. Kant's famous phrase describing the moral consciousness as the sun in the moral universe. It is an essentially Kantian idea. We may trace something of the influence of Froude's master, Carlyle, in this sentence.

41. *cant*: trite hypocrisy.

PAGE 156. 14. *contemptible superstition*: this is Froude's and Knox's superficial and bigoted view of Roman Catholicism. All Froude's historical work is permeated with such views.

18. *Ten Commandments*: the Ten Commandments are given in the Old Testament, in the Book of Exodus, and were adopted by the Christian religion as the basis of its moral law.

24. *Calvinist*: a follower of the Swiss Protestant Reformer, Calvin, whose creed was terribly logical and pitiless in the hands of extremists.

25. *M. Fontenay*: the brother of M. Nau, Secretary to Queen Mary, and one of her numerous French courtiers. Froude records this passage also in his *History of England*, vol. xi., chap. 31.

26. *here*: at St. Andrews.

28. *Catholic Lords*: the party of Scotch Catholics who, led by Huntly, were leagued together against the Reforming party, in the reign of Queen Mary.

36. *Athenians*: this is perhaps a reference to the interview between the Athenians and the Melians (*Thucydides*, V. 84–113), throughout which the Athenians are continually insisting on expediency as opposed to the claim for justice.

PAGE 157. 8. *Jesuitism*: a Jesuit is a member of the Society of Jesus, a religious order founded by St. Ignatius Loyola in 1540,

its activities being largely missionary and educational. Jesuitism implies to most Protestants the idea of casuistry and the doctrine that the end justifies the means, or more simply of unscrupulousness.

*massacre of St. Bartholomew*: in 1572 a massacre of Huguenots, or French Protestants, took place by royal order in France, in Paris from August 24 to September 17, and in the provinces until October 3.

14. *Times are changed*: a religious or moral reformer no longer is in danger of the punishment of death by burning or hanging.

32. *Necesse est*, etc.: a quotation from Vergil, *Aeneid* VI, lines 737-738. It is roughly translated in the following phrase.

PAGE 158. 1. *Our intellectual joints*, etc.: this is a metaphorical statement of the idea in the preceding sentence.

22. *Noblesse oblige*: nobility of birth implies an obligation to nobility of life, a proverbial French phrase.

29. *linked together*: Scotland and England were united politically in 1603, when the King of Scotland, James VI, succeeded to the throne of England as James I.

33. *More than once*: in resisting Mary, Queen of Scots, who was a Catholic and aimed at the throne of England, and in the great Rebellion, which began in Scotland, upon a question of ecclesiastical privilege.

35. *our English parsons*: Froude refers to the growth of Ritualism in the Church of England, which was bringing Anglicanism nearer to Roman Catholicism.

*the Stuarts*: the first Stuart king was the Scotch James VI (James I of England) and the last was James II of England, who was deposed in 1688.

PAGE 159. 8. *your education*: on the whole the Scotch system of elementary, secondary, and university education was for long more complete, more universal and democratic, and less expensive than the English system. Until quite recently, at any rate, a far larger proportion of the population attended the schools and Universities, and a higher degree of literacy was attained, than in England. Froude was an Englishman, but a great admirer of the Scotch, and was the chief disciple of the Scotch man of letters, Carlyle.

16. *barrier of expense*: there is no comparison between the cost of a Scotch University education and that of the older English Universities. A considerable proportion of Scotch University students has always been drawn from the working or peasant classes.

23. *Education is on everybody's lips*: 1869 was the year of preparation for the great educational reforms of 1870, and the conflict between classical and modern ideals of education was in full activity.

PAGE 160. 17. *an educated man*: the whole of this paragraph applies equally to India to-day, and the question still waits for an answer. On the whole, the tendency is to answer it as Froude answers it, and to act upon his ideal.

27. *He was apprenticed*: apprenticeship and child labour have been practically abolished by the growth of industrialism and by compulsory education. There is a great deal to be said for a system



of guilds and apprentices when a trade is a true handicraft, but very little when industries are carried on by machinery, centralised, and speeded-up as in modern conditions.

34. *your parish schools*: there were parish schools in Scotland, founded by the Church from the twelfth century onwards. Knox's *Book of Discipline* in 1561 proposed to found schools in every parish on the proceeds of the endowments of the Roman Catholic Church, just as it has been proposed to-day to dispose of the funds of the Church in Wales. The proposal was rejected, however, as a matter of fact, for not all Reformers were as disinterested as Knox. It was not until 1696 that a school was established by law in every parish.

PAGE 161. 1. *United States*: the system and history of schools in the United States is difficult to summarise, for they vary in each state. The system was developed later, and is less complete, in Virginia, for example, than in New York. On the whole, however, the boast is fairly just.

16. *Spinoza*: Baruch (or, as he called himself, Benedict) Spinoza (1633–1677) was a famous Dutch Jew philosopher. He published his *Ethics* in 1665, from which this quotation is taken.

24. *catechising*: a method of religious teaching by means of set questions and answers, to be learnt and repeated. The Church Catechism (first part) was inserted in the Prayer Book in 1549, and added to in 1604, and was ordered to be taught in all schools, and by the priests to the children of the parish.

25. *Sunday-school*: a society was founded in 1785 by Robert Raikes, the Society for Promoting Sunday Schools. The schools were originally of a charitable nature, and constituted the beginnings of general popular education. They are now of a purely religious and supplementary nature, and are directed by the various churches.

40. *Paris*: the University of Paris was formally constituted as a corporation in 1210, that of Padua in Italy in 1222, that of Salamanca in Spain in 1243. These were three of the most famous Universities in Europe in the Middle Ages.

*Abelard*: Peter Abelard (1079–1142) was a famous teacher and theologian of the twelfth century, who made Paris the centre of education in France, and indeed in Europe by his far-reaching reputation. He is more generally known as the hero of the tragic story of his relations with his pupil Heloise.

PAGE 162. 4. *\*scholars wandering*: licences to beg were given to scholars if necessary. On the whole, Froude exaggerates the general poverty of the students of the Middle Ages. There was much more luxury among them than he suggests.

13. *Earl of Essex*: see Note on page 51, 39. A corrective to these statements may be found in the university play, *The Return from Parnassus* (1600), wherein the playwright complains that the student, on returning home, finds it too bare and simple after the luxury of the University.

21. *He went without, etc.*: this is a pretty idea. But to represent ~~the~~ students of the Middle Ages and Renaissance as a sort of monastic order, vowed to poverty by choice, is erroneous. They were

poor, like most people, by misfortune. If they were rich they spent their money in riotous living. The average character of the student has not changed much through the ages, though the majority of students are no longer theologians.

26. *Buchanan*: George Buchanan (1506-1582) studied at St. Andrews, and in 1562 was Latin tutor to Queen Mary, though later on he went over to the party of her enemies, and was appointed Moderator of the General Assembly of the Reformed Church. He was a notable writer of Latin verse, and wrote also a History of Scotland in the sixteenth century and works on political theory.

*Luther*: Martin Luther (1483-1536) was the famous German Protestant religious reformer. Of peasant family, he became a student and received a licence to beg at first, and was afterwards a free student at Eisenach.

27. *Tyndal*: William Tyndale (c. 1492-1536) studied both at Oxford and Cambridge, and became tutor to the Walsh family. The translation of the Bible was forbidden in England, and he did the work at Antwerp and Hamburg, his New Testament reaching England in 1526. He was burned in 1536.

28. *Kepler*: Johann Kepler (1571-1630) was a notable German astronomer. He worked on a farm before becoming a student at Tübingen.

*Robert Burns* (1759-1796) was the famous Scottish ploughman poet, one of the greatest of English lyric poets, and the national poet of Scotland.

35. *discipline of poverty*: allowing for the difference in the general standard of living, the discipline of poverty is by no means gone either in England or Scotland to-day.

38. *march-of-intellect man*: a man who puts his trust in the rapid advance and spread of knowledge. Cf. Disraeli's 'railway intellect' (see note on p. 64, 33).

PAGE 163. 12. *competitive examination*: the beginnings of this system of appointing civil servants were made in 1853, by closed competitive examination, the first examinations being held in 1855. In 1870 all services except the Department of Foreign Affairs were recruited by open competition.

19. *I could myself*: Froude was himself a professional historian.

28. *cramming*: this is a complaint familiar to India and exaggerated there. The vice is there due mainly to inherited tendencies and educational traditions. In the case of the examinations for the Civil Services the results are less dangerous, for the system is merely an expedient to prevent patronage and on the whole it serves its purpose, and would be difficult to replace.

PAGE 164. 11. *More than one man*: surely Froude has forgotten, in his zeal for utilitarian training and for the somewhat doubtful moral value of enforced poverty, the private, corporate, and civic ideals that a University may teach, that Oxford prides itself on teaching, and that are of some importance in the history of England. It is certainly not enough to teach these things only, but they are essen-



tial, and utilitarianism is apt to neglect them. The word 'gentleman' does not mean 'cultivated idler.'

19. *three R's*: Reading, 'Riting, and 'Rithmetic.

21. *honours*: e.g. in the Greats School at Oxford.

40. *Lord Brougham*: Henry, Lord Brougham (1778-1868) was one of the founders of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802, entered Parliament in 1809, helped to found the first Mechanics' Institute in 1823, the Society for Diffusion of Useful Knowledge in 1825, and the London University in 1828. He was a prominent speaker on behalf of Reform, and was Lord Chancellor from 1830 to 1834. Brougham's advocacy of the 'march of intellect' is satirised in Peacock's novels.

PAGE 165. 1. *Bacon*: Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam (1561-1626), is one of the greatest names in English literature. He was a statesman, philosopher, and author. He rose to be Lord Chancellor in 1618, but his public life ended in disgrace. His chief works are *Essays* (1597), *The Advancement of Learning* (1605), and the *Novum Organum* (1620).

*William Cobbett* (1762-1835) was a bookseller, journalist, and politician, and a Radical reformer. He was imprisoned for libel for two years in 1810-1812, and entered Parliament in 1832.

A fair corrective to this dictum of Cobbett is that of Christ, quoted from the Book of Deuteronomy, viii. 3: 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'

4. *lecture on education*: I do not know who this speaker was. One might suspect Bright or William Johnson Fox (see note on p. 62, 11).

19. *As you may see*: Froude's Homeric metaphor shows that Oxford had helped to prepare him for the trade of public orator, at any rate!

36. *political economist*: one of the evolutionist school no doubt. Herbert Spencer has some ideas not unlike this.

39. *Olympian gods*: Mount Olympus, in Thessaly, was supposed by the ancient Greeks to be the abode of the gods. The Empyrean, literally 'the sphere of fire,' was the firmament, or the highest heaven.

PAGE 166. 8. *The process*: this is a fairly frequent process obtaining in America, which Froude praises so highly.

13. *no industrial training*: one might surely add, no moral training.

14. *Miss Nightingale*: Florence Nightingale (1820-1910) was a philanthropist, and the famous pioneer in nursing and sanitation, the 'angel with a lamp' in the Crimean War.

32. *disguise it*: a landowner, for example, lives on the work of his tenants, and so begs or steals from them: a purely Socialistic theory.

PAGE 167. 23. *Coleridge*: Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) was the leader, with Wordsworth, of English Romanticism, and a notable critic and lyric poet, the author of *The Ancient Mariner*,

PAGE 168. 11. *Novum Organon*: (or *Organum*) a work of Bacon, published in 1620. The title means 'a new instrument of knowledge,' namely inductive logic, by which Bacon hoped to bring all science within reach.

25. *millennium*: the word means a thousand years, and refers to the prophecy in the Book of Revelation that Christ shall reign on earth during a thousand years of peace. Some believed that He would rule in visible presence. The word is now generally used to mean an era of the perfection of mankind in the distant future.

PAGE 169. 1. *blue-books*: official reports to Parliament.

38. *Norman-French*: after the Norman Conquest of England in 1066 the language of the Court and of the law was French.

The whole of this argument tends to that narrow specialisation which is a danger of the present day, and which thrusts aside and crowds out truly liberal education. 'Man shall not live by bread alone' is true also of education.

40. *Livy*: Livy is a Latin, Thucydides a Greek, historian.

41. *Are you to be a doctor*: the excellent custom in Scotland is to take an Arts course before proceeding to the Medical School. Wisdom and moral strength are as necessary to the doctor as technical instruction.

PAGE 170. 17. *of earth, earthy*: this is a quotation from St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Chapter 15, verse 47. The phrase here means extremely unideal and utilitarian.

23. *leisure hereafter*: unfortunately it is generally too late then. It would be almost equally true to speak of religion as 'ornament.'

30. *Non multa sed multum*: not many things but much of one thing.

PAGE 171. 6. *literæ humaniores*: i.e. humane letters and literature.

9. *Oxford teaching*: Oxford has changed a good deal in these respects of late.

14. *clerical activity*: the Oxford Movement may be dated from 1833.

18. *moral dishonesty*: the signs of this may be seen in the legislation which remedied it, the Adulteration Acts from 1872-1875 and the Weights and Measures Act of 1878. It is curious to note that Bright condoned these frauds as being inseparable from competition.

28. *ecclesiastical petticoats*: Froude takes the question of vestments as typical of the Oxford Movement, a somewhat superficial statement of a profound and important question. The Public Worship Regulation Act in 1874 attempted to settle this particular controversy regarding the vestments to be worn by priests of the Church of England, but without success, and the controversy still continues.

30. *mysteries of the faith*: religious truths divinely revealed, especially those beyond human reason.

*divine mission*: the function of the clergy as ordained by Christ,



31. *apostolical succession*: the inheritance by the Church of the functions of the apostles sent out by Christ.

32. *justification*: the question whether a man is saved by faith or whether a virtuous life is essential.

*verbal inspiration*: the literal truth of the Bible as the Word of God.

33. *efficacy of the sacraments*: the necessity and power of Baptism and Communion, for example.

Froude speaks as if Scotland were free from theological disputation, whereas it is positively a national characteristic.

37. *Bishop Blomfield*: Charles James Blomfield (1786–1857) was a notable classical scholar and prelate, Bishop of Chester 1824–1828, and of London 1828–1857.

PAGE 172. 22. *superfluous babies*: the Spartans exposed weakly or deformed babies, and female infanticide in China used to be a notorious evil.

41. *this larger sphere*: it is at least interesting that the Germans, with their highly specialised and utilitarian system of education, have failed lamentably as colonial administrators.

PAGE 173. 27. *convicts*: British colonies were used as convict settlements for a long time.

*Pilgrim Fathers*: a number of Puritans emigrated to New England in 1620, on the *Mayflower*, in search of religious freedom.

PAGE 174. 15. *Novalis*: the pseudonym of Friedrich von Hardenberg (1772–1801), the notable German literary critic and mystical philosopher, who had a considerable influence upon Carlyle.

18. *Take no thought*, etc.: this is quoted, inexactly, from the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Chapter 6, verses 28–32.

30. *the Roman Curtius*: in 360 B.C. a Roman youth, Curtius, sacrificed himself for the sake of Rome and thereby averted evil from his country. He threw himself, mounted upon a horse, into a gulf which had opened in the Forum. The play on words which follows is a rare example of Froude's deficient sense of humour.

PAGE 175. 15. *the humanities*: i.e. Greek, Latin, and philosophy; in Scotland strictly Latin.

19. *St. Paul* was by trade a tent-maker. Cf. Acts of the Apostles xviii. 3.

36. *Spinoza* lived in frugal simplicity a life of lonely meditation, and we find him refusing a professorship of philosophy at Heidelberg.

PAGE 176. 22. *The best lawyer*, etc.: this is notoriously not the case universally, for practices and partnerships must be bought, and 'influence' is important.

25. *The present rule*: doubtless this is generally true, but the exceptions, of which Froude was himself an example, are so numerous as to make the distinction dangerous.

39. *Shakespeare's plays*: yet Shakespeare undoubtedly made a fortune by his plays.

40. *Milton*: to be precise, £5 down was paid to Milton, a further £5 for the second edition, and a final £8 to his widow.

41. *Bishop Butler* : Joseph Butler (1692-1752) was made Bishop of Durham in 1750. His famous theological work, the *Analogy of Religion* (1736), sought to prove the harmony between revealed religion and the natural world. It would be more true to call him the best-known theological writer than 'the greatest prelate.'

The work ran into numerous editions, and must have made a fortune for some one, if not for the Bishop.

PAGE 177. 2. *Spinoza's works* : Spinoza's doctrines of pantheism, of the unity of soul and body, of the unity of the universe, have had a vast influence upon subsequent European thought.

8. *Tennyson* : Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1809-1892), was, with Browning, the greatest of English poets of the nineteenth century. He was made Poet Laureate in 1850, and was raised to the peerage in 1884. *In Memoriam* (1850) and *The Idylls of the King* (1859-1885) are his best known poems.

9. *Thomas Carlyle* (1795-1881) was a great and poetic prose-writer and historian, and the intimate friend and master of Froude. His *Sartor Resartus* (1833-34) was a failure, but his later works, such as the *History of the French Revolution* (1837), and the history of *Frederick the Great* (1858-1865), gave him fame and a competence.

13. *Goethe* : Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) was the greatest of German men of letters and a man of powerful and universal genius, great as poet, dramatist, and prose-writer, also as statesman and administrator of the State of Weimar, and as a man of large human wisdom.

16. *Belgravian novelist* : a novelist who should write for the delectation of the dwellers in Belgravia or other fashionable districts in London : Bulwer-Lytton, Disraeli, or Ouida, for example.

PAGE 178. 25. *latitudinarianism* : this name is applied to the doctrines of those who belong to the *Broad Church* party. The word means 'breadth of view,' and implies intellectualism and denial of the mysteries of faith.

29. *cannot away with* : cannot tolerate.

PAGE 179. 14. *We cannot make true things false, etc.* : Froude is still thinking of the Oxford Movement, and it is upon these thoughts that he closes his speech.

39. *This above all, etc.* : adapted from the words of Polonius in *Hamlet*, Act I, Sc. iii. lines 78-80.



PRINTED BY  
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,  
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.



OXFORD

OXFORD

OXFORD

OF

OF

OF

HOWELL, W. HOWELL, W. HOWELL, W.

Author of 'The

Author of 'The

Author of 'The

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



# AS ON DATE ECTS

For F

in Indian Schools and

Arranged by J. C. JENNINGS, M.A., Oxon., I.E.S.  
Principal of Muir Central College, Allahabad

FIRST SERIES. One Rupee.

SECOND SERIES. One Rupee, four Annas.

FIRST AND SECOND SERIES together.  
Two Rupees.



THIS new prose selection by an author already well known in Indian educational circles will be especially welcome in view of the modern movement in favour of the inculcation of moral and social ideals by the aid of literature. The extracts, which are models of style as well as of thought, have been chosen from authors such as Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Adam Smith, Emerson, Carlyle, Comte, Herbert Spencer, Lecky, J. S. Mill, Ruskin, and T. H. Green, and include pieces from Sir Narayan G. Chandavarkar's pen. They are selected with a view to emphasizing the duty which we owe to the State and to one another; they deal with a great many aspects of social life, and will be found to possess a varied interest. Each Series contains two parts, and the whole selection is graduated in difficulty to suit the needs of readers of all capacities above the most elementary. Series I will be found suitable for Matriculation or early University work, while Series II is adapted to the Intermediate and B.A. Standards.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
17-19 ELPHINSTONE CIRCLE, BOMBAY

